Calendar No. 285

98TH CONGRESS, 1st Session } SENATE { REPORT No. 98-180

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1984

JULY 14 (legislative day, JULY 11), 1983.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. MATTINGLY, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 3263]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 3263) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate with various amendments, and presents herewith information relative to the changes made:

Amount of bill passed by House	$6,961,432,000
Amount of increase by Senate over the House	278,904,000
Total of bill as reported to Senate	7,240,336,000
Amount of 1984 budget estimate	8,655,127,000
Amount of 1983 appropriations	7,222,682,000
The bill as reported to the Senate:	
Under the budget estimate, 1984	1,414,791,000
Above appropriations for fiscal year 1983	17,654,000

S18312

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Background:	
Purpose of the bill	3
Comparative statement	3
Summary of the bill	6
Compliance with section 308 of the Budget Control Act	6
Committee recommendations	6
Items of special interest	7
Military construction, Army	23
Military construction, Navy	28
Military construction, Air Force	34
Military construction, Defense Agencies	38
North Atlantic Treaty Organization	41
Military construction, Guard and Reserve Components	41
Family housing, overview	43
Family housing, Army	46
Family housing, Navy	48
Family housing, Air Force	49
Family housing, Defense Agencies	50
General provisions	51
Project listing by location	54

BACKGROUND

Purpose of the Bill

The Military Construction Appropriation Bill provides necessary funding for the planning, design, construction, alteration, and improvement of military facilities worldwide, both for Active and Reserve Forces. It also finances the construction, alteration, improvement, operation and maintenance of all military family housing, including payments against past housing mortgage indebtedness. Certain types of community impact assistance are provided, as well as assistance to members who face loss on the sale of private residences due to installation realinements. The bill is also the source for the U.S. share of NATO infrastructure construction costs.

Comparative Statement

The fiscal year 1984 budget requests appropriations totaling $8,655,127,000. The following table displays this request, and compares it with the current fiscal year, the House amount, and the Committee recommendation:

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY

Item	1983 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Increase (+) or decrease (-) compared with— 1983 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Military construction, Army	$929,720,000	$1,375,000,000	$1,216,565,000	$1,142,040,000	+$212,320,000	-$232,960,000	-$73,525,000
Military construction, Navy	1,080,750,000	1,343,700,000	1,181,905,000	1,232,506,000	+151,756,000	-111,194,000	+50,601,000
Military construction, Air Force	1,551,414,000	2,300,900,000	1,374,751,000	1,502,491,000	-48,923,000	-798,409,000	+127,740,000
Rescission			-91,000,000				+91,000,000
Military construction, Defense Agencies	339,770,000	398,400,000	259,042,000	311,750,000	-28,020,000	-86,650,000	+52,708,000
Transfer, not to exceed	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)			(-20,000,000)	(-20,000,000)	
North Atlantic Treaty Organization Infrastructure	325,000,000	150,000,000	100,000,000	50,000,000	-275,000,000	-100,000,000	-50,000,000
Military construction, Army National Guard	54,958,000	55,300,000	65,127,000	59,300,000	+4,342,000	+4,000,000	-5,827,000
Military construction, Air National Guard	127,900,000	79,900,000	110,352,000	79,900,000	-48,000,000		-30,452,000
Military construction, Army Reserve	41,800,000	52,700,000	52,700,000	54,700,000	+12,900,000	+2,000,000	+2,000,000
Military construction, Naval Reserve	25,200,000	24,800,000	28,795,000	26,810,000	+1,610,000	+2,010,000	-1,985,000
Military construction, Air Force Reserve	35,600,000	42,200,000	42,200,000	41,200,000	+5,600,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000
Total, military construction	4,512,112,000	5,822,900,000	4,339,437,000	4,500,697,000	-11,415,000	-1,322,203,000	+161,260,000
Family housing, Army	1,078,874,000	1,272,639,000	1,250,551,000	1,282,843,000	+203,969,000	+10,204,000	+32,292,000
Portion applied to debt reduction	-38,534,000	-31,700,000	-31,700,000	-31,700,000	+6,834,000		
Subtotal, family housing, Army	1,040,340,000	1,240,939,000	1,218,851,000	1,251,143,000	+210,803,000	+10,204,000	+32,292,000
Family housing, Navy	769,098,000	703,877,000	616,374,000	654,527,000	-114,571,000	-49,350,000	+38,153,000
Portion applied to debt reduction	-28,007,000	-28,133,000	-28,133,000	-28,133,000	-126,000		
Subtotal, family housing, Navy	741,091,000	675,744,000	588,241,000	626,394,000	-114,697,000	-49,350,000	+38,153,000

Family housing, Air Force	970,361,000	947,176,000	849,605,000	893,734,000	-76,627,000	-53,442,000	+44,129,000
Portion applied to debt reduction	-57,535,000	-51,376,000	-51,376,000	-51,376,000	+6,159,000	.....	.....
Subtotal, family housing, Air Force	912,826,000	895,800,000	798,229,000	842,358,000	-70,468,000	-53,442,000	+44,129,000
Family housing, Defense Agencies	14,313,000	19,744,000	16,674,000	19,744,000	+5,431,000	.....	+3,070,000
Total family housing (budget authority)	2,832,646,000	2,943,436,000	2,733,204,000	2,850,848,000	+18,202,000	-92,586,000	+117,644,000
Total portion applied to debt reduction	-124,076,000	-111,209,000	-111,209,000	-111,209,000	+12,867,000	.....	.....
Total, family housing	2,708,570,000	2,832,227,000	2,621,995,000	2,739,639,000	+31,069,000	-92,586,000	+117,644,000
Homeowners assistance fund, Defense	2,000,000	.....	.....	.....	-2,000,000	.....	.....
Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority	7,222,682,000	8,655,127,000	6,961,432,000	7,240,336,000	+17,654,000	-1,414,791,000	+278,904,000

Summary of the Bill

The Committee recommends a total of $7,240,336,000 in new budget authority/appropriations for fiscal year 1984 programs under its jurisdiction. Significant comparisons are noted below:

Fiscal year 1984 budget request: Budget authority	$8,655,127,000
Committee recommendation for fiscal year 1984: Budget authority	7,240,336,000
Which is—	
Over new budget authority granted in fiscal year 1983 by	17,654,000
Under the budget request by	1,414,791,000
Over the House bill by	278,904,000

Compliance With Section 308 of the Budget Control Act

Section 308(a) of the Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344) requires that the Committee include in its report a comparison of its recommendations with levels contained in the First Concurrent Resolution. Appropriate data are reflected below:

BUDGETARY IMPACT OF BILL

PREPARED BY THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE PURSUANT TO SEC. 308(a), PUBLIC LAW 93–344

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority		Outlays	
	Committee allocation	Amount in bill	Committee allocation	Amount in bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with the Committee allocation to its subcommittees of amounts in the First Concurrent Resolution for 1984: Subcommittee on Military Construction				
Projections of outlays associated with budget authority recommended in the bill:				
1984				
1985				
1986				
1987				
1988 and future year				
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 1984 in the bill				

[1] Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.
[2] Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

Committee Recommendation

As previously noted, the Committee is recommending new fiscal year 1984 appropriations of $7,240,336,000. This is $1,414,791,000 under the budget request and $278,904,000 above House allowances. The basis for this recommendation is contained in succeeding paragraphs for special interest items, and under the discussions pertaining to each individual appropriation.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Conformance With Authorization Bill

The Senate Armed Services Committee reported S. 675, the Omnibus Defense Authorization Act, 1984, which contains the authorization for the majority of the military construction projects included in this bill. Because conference action on the military construction authorization bill has not been completed at the time this bill is being considered, the Committee is recommending only projects which are recommended for authorization in S. 675. The Committee recommendations are in full compliance with those of the authorizing committee.

Military Construction Budgeting

The Committee has recommended $7,240,336,000 for various military construction and family housing projects throughout the world. These facilities will support all Defense Department programs ranging from small repair projects to major new facilities to support weapons systems.

The Committee supports the need for military construction to provide increased readiness and to address quality of life issues.

The Committee has recommended reductions to various programs that are highlighted throughout this report. Reductions made by the Committee conform in many cases to those contained in the Senate authorization bill. However, the Committee has made reductions as it deemed appropriate based on information made available through justification documents, hearings, and other evidence which has come to the Committee's attention.

The Committee believes that while this bill does reflect a $1,414,791,000 reduction from the President's request, that all of the major projects have been provided and that the impact of the reduction will not be of major consequence to the Defense Department.

Alternative construction methods.—The Committee is fully aware of the procedures which are followed within the Defense Department to budget for the best facilities at the best possible price. The Committee is also aware that the construction industry like so many other industries continues to grow with new technology and new procedures. The Committee urges the Defense Department to keep abreast of all new methods of construction which might be useful to the Department. The House has suggested several different procedures which could prove beneficial to the Department as well as the American taxpayer.

Some of the areas discussed were for alternative construction techniques; turnkey contracting; packaging similar projects; standard design; performance specifications; legislative actions; and materials such as modular and prefabrication. The Committee would appreciate com-

ment by the Defense Department on these suggestions as part of the justification for the President's budget. These suggestions, as mentioned by the House, should be in the form of reports during the fiscal year 1985 hearing process.

Overseas Basing

The United States continues, as part of its overall foreign policy, to base American forces throughout the world. The Committee recommendation provides about $2,000,000,000 for facilities and their support outside the United States. For many years there was little or no change in overseas basing, but in the recent past the Committee has witnessed a trend which has requested more than 20 new sites funded by the United States. The Committee has supported these new sites, particularly those in support of the Rapid Deployment Force (RDF). The Committee continues to support the many initiatives suggested as a way to improve our defense capabilities, and understands the need for such a commitment.

The Committee believes, however, that while the need for overseas bases is vitally important, we must not forget the enormous cost involved with these programs. The Committee has supported in the past, and continues to support, the need for an ever-increasing commitment from our Allies to provide facilities whenever possible. The Department of Defense should continue every effort to obtain any form of support from host governments which can relieve the financial burden placed on the United States to build, equip, operate, and maintain our overseas bases.

New general provision.—To alert the Defense Department to the Committee's concern over this important area, a general provision has been included in this bill as section 118. This sense of the Congress provision has appeared previously in this act. The Committee urges the Department to do everything within its power to stress the need, with our Allies, to work together to provide the best possible defense for the free world. The Committee also urges the Department to insure that every avenue of funds has been closed for overseas bases prior to including projects in the military construction budget.

Host nation support can take the form of many different types of contributions. It should not be limited to wartime and operational facilities. In many instances, it is the quality of life projects which receive the lower priority for budgeting. And yet, these types of facilities are vitally important to morale. The Committee hopes that the Department will follow the intent of the language contained in this report and the House report and make increased host nation support one of the highest priority items for defense issues.

Notification of new bases overseas.—The Committee believes that the Defense Department has been forthcoming in providing details of new overseas bases. The House, however, has added a general provision to the bill which required prior Committee approval before any new base is initiated. The Committee has modified the language to require notification and believes that full disclosure of plans for new bases is a key to continued support by the Congress.

NATO Infrastructure Program

The Committee has always been a strong supporter of NATO and in the military construction bill has always endorsed the NATO infrastructure account as an excellent example of cooperation with our Allies to provide necessary facilities to support the NATO mission.

The infrastructure account is 30 years old. Each member of NATO provides funds to a central account that is used for the disbursement of moneys to construct various projects throughout the member nations. The U.S. contribution to the infrastructure account amounts to about 27 percent of the funds collected. It should be noted, however, that the vast majority of the projects funded from the account are used primarily by U.S. personnel. This factor has always been used to show that the United States gets its fair share from the NATO account. And, indeed, the NATO program has provided positively toward the U.S. presence throughout the NATO countries.

The Committee continues its strong support for NATO and the NATO infrastructure account. However, the Committee is alarmed over the indifference which the Department of Defense has taken to past instructions by the Committees on Appropriations regarding the recoupment of prefinanced project costs from the NATO account.

With that in mind, the Committee has taken what is undoubtedly the strongest position ever taken by this Committee with regard to the request for the NATO infrastructure account. The Committee is recommending only $50,000,000 of the $150,000,000 request.

The Committee has taken this action only after careful consideration. The NATO infrastructure account in the past 10 years has been prefinanced—by U.S. funding of individual NATO-eligible projects—in the hundreds of millions of dollars' range and at this time approximately $256,000,000 remains to be recouped from the account and returned to the U.S. Treasury. The Committee has no objection to prefinancing for especially important projects. And, in fact, the Committee has recommended in this bill the prefinancing of $66,000,000 for the upgrade of bases in Turkey. What concerns the Committee is the lack of response from the Defense Department as to when the recoupment will increase to the point where the Committee can see an end to the growth in the prefinanced project listing.

The Committee is also concerned to learn that an unobligated balance of $500,000,000 remains in the NATO infrastructure account.

The Committee believes that many areas must be reviewed with regard to the NATO infrastructure account. One such area is how U.S. payments are advanced prior to obligation. Another important area is the eligibility requirements which in many cases do not meet U.S. requirements and thus force the United States to contribute above what NATO will pay for specific projects.

In light of the increased pressure on the Committee to keep defense spending in line, it is paramount that every program be fully justified. The Committee believes that the lack of response from the Defense Department regarding this account makes it difficult to justify the full budget request.

The Committee is hopeful that the Department will provide at the earliest possible time information that will show the Committee how the recoupment process will be improved to decrease the $256,000,000 balance. The Committee notes that the bidding climate that has provided nearly $750,000,000 in available savings over the past 2 years has not been confined to U.S. projects. The Army has been receiving very good bids on projects throughout Europe in the same areas that NATO facilities are being built. The Committee believes that savings may be available to NATO which could be used to offset recoupment.

The Committee continues to believe that the NATO infrastructure account is an important element of our overall NATO posture. The Committee will look more favorably on this account once there are indications that the Department of Defense is improving their process to administer funds to and from this account.

Accountability in NATO's infrastructure program.—As noted in earlier paragraphs, the Committee is very concerned over the NATO infrastructure account. The Committee expects to hold detailed hearings next fiscal year on this matter. In that light, the Committee is including a rather detailed section on accountability. The Committee urges the Defense Department to carefully consider the language and be prepared to discuss it during next year's hearings.

The Committee believes that the NATO commonly funded infrastructure program, while laudable in its original objectives, may well be fatally flawed. The system, as it presently exists, is nowhere set down in a single, definitive document. As it is currently administered, it is a mixture of written directives, committee decisions, and precedents. The net result of all this is that NATO commonly funded infrastructure has evolved into a system in which no entity, individual, or nation is really accountable to insure the most effective use of common funds. The Committee is concerned that this flaw impacts on all phases of the present system and works against all attempts at effective management of the infrastructure common funds to a degree that ultimately can render the system ineffective as a tool of the Alliance.

It is clear that the system needs improved accountability. The present system seems to encourage "buying in" to the infrastructure program with unrealistically low project estimates. This, in turn, produces almost universal cost overruns, resulting in continual turmoil in infrastructure programing. In the current slice group there does not seem to be any effective, long-term planning or programing that can articulate military requirements to ministers in the detail required to insure accountability in the use of resources.

Without accountability there is little incentive to take those prudent steps required to build the much-needed facilities in a timely fashion and to avoid cost escalation brought on by repeated delays in an inflationary environment. Unfortunately, the absence of program planning further complicates this situation. Widely fluctuating program levels imposed on MOD organizations, which have a very limited ability to respond to such sizeable fluctuations in workload, makes the record of delayed project execution to be even worse.

The Committee has learned that the recent SHAPE initiative to improve the infrastructure planning system and to introduce multiyear functional programing harmonized with NATO plans and force goals is certainly an essential step in overhauling the present infrastructure system and is a prerequisite for any further improvements. This very constructive effort will probably realize only a small portion of its potential unless an attempt is made to go one step further and firmly establish accountability. Positive incentives should become an integral part of the NATO commonly funded infrastructure program.

The Committee is suggesting an outline for a sequence of events and a partial list of rules for administering the infrastructure program. These procedures could go a long way toward injecting a concept of accountability into the NATO infrastructure system and could do so without undue impact on workload or expense.

SUGGESTED SEQUENCE OF EVENTS IN PROGRAMING AND CONSTRUCTION OF A NATO INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT

Projects or programs can be entered in the long-term infrastructure programing plan at any time prior to 2 years from the planned funding date, bearing in mind that the entire plan must be adjusted to meet financial resource constraints while continuing higher priority program objectives. However, under a routine normal planning cycle, the following events would occur:

1. Six years prior to the projected funding date the host nation includes the projects in the long-term infrastructure program plan with a budget estimate.

2. The plan is reviewed by the host nation, PSC, MSC, and SHAPE, and approved or adjusted each year. Adjustments are made for projects which have been approved for construction, cost increases or decreases, resource availability, and changes and/or revisions in priority or emphasis of functional programs.

3. Each project is reviewed annually by the host nation MOD to improve scope definition and budget estimate for each project approved for inclusion in the plan as much as possible without accomplishing preliminary design as the project moves from 6 years before the fund approval date to 2 years before the fund approval date.

4. If the project is approved for inclusion in the plan at the point where it is 2 years from the projected fund approval date, the host nation is automatically authorized to prepare or contract for the preparation of a 35-percent design and a detailed engineered cost estimate. The 35-percent design and detailed cost estimate should be submitted to PSC, MSC, SHAPE, and NATO about 1 year prior to the projected funding date.

5. After review of the 35-percent design and cost estimate by PSC, MSC, MNC, and NIS and resolution of any questions on scope or cost estimate, necessary adjustments are made to the long-term infrastructure programing plan and the project is submitted to SHAPE for submittal to NATO for NATO common infrastructure funding approval. This submittal by the host nation MOD indicates a willingness on the part of the host nation to construct the specified scope, to have the contract

package ready to award within 2 years and to perform the design and construction at a maximum cost to NATO of the detailed estimated costs including design costs, administration costs, and nominal contingency of probably 10 percent. It is important to note that from this point on, any decision by the host nation not to proceed with the project at the approved scope and within the approved cost to NATO results in cancellation of the project with the result that it may not be resubmitted for inclusion in the long-range functional programing plan at a point less than 2 years prior to the projected funding date.

6. Upon approval by NATO of the project for funding (which should be reasonably assured after extensive review and refinement during several iterations of the programing plan) the host nation proceeds with design and preparation of the contracting documents. Bids must be received and the project ready for award within 2 years or defacto the project is canceled. The nation may unilaterally cancel the project at any time prior to award. However, award of the contract obligates the nation to complete the agreed scope for a price not to exceed the approved program price.

7. The criteria for reimbursement of costs to the host nation MOD will be the same as existing except that scope or costs in excess of that agreed will not be reimbursed. All legitimate auditable costs will be reimbursed but in no instance will costs be reimbursed in excess of those programed. Failure of the nation to complete the scope of facilities agreed will preclude reimbursement of any amount greater than the approved program amount less the estimated cost of facilities not provided as determined by NIS.

SUGGESTED INFRASTRUCTURE RULES

1. If a project is canceled and then reinserted in the plan, NATO will not reimburse the nation for a new 35-percent design and detailed cost estimate unless scope has been redefined to an extent which requires it. Updating the detailed cost estimate is reimbursable.

2. If annual review of the long-term programing plan results in need for adjustment to the plan which potentially affects other project and program priorities in the plan, adjustments must be made in such a manner that program objectives of higher priority programs (higher than the program being adjusted) are not adversely affected and the plan continues to fall within the financial constraints established for the plan or program.

3. Maximum percentages of project cost reimbursable for 35-percent design, detailed cost estimates, cost estimate updates, design and bid package preparation, administrative and quality assurance cost, as well as percentage of project costs permitted as contingency will be established by the Infrastructure Committee based on analysis provided by NATO international staff. These amounts should be reviewed when the need is evident but at no more than 5-year intervals.

4. Approval of programed projects by NATO will include approval of scope and funding based on the 35-percent design and detailed cost estimate. Only if significant change occurs in the design scopes or con-

cept of design during completion of the design of project is NIS review and approval required. Only those scope items meeting NATO criteria will be eligible for reimbursement unless specifically approved by NIS. The host nation MOD may request NIS review to insure approval of designed scope prior to contract award.

5. If all elements of agreed scope are not constructed for any project, an amount sufficient to finance these omissions at current costs will be withheld from reimbursements so that the total of reimbursements, plus amount withheld for scope deficiencies, will not exceed the programed amount. The withheld amount for scope deficiencies will be satisfied from the programed amount first.

6. The relationship between NATO and the nation responsible for project execution will be between NATO and the host nation MOD only. Since there exists a measure of risk borne by the host nation, nothing shall preclude the host MOD from entering into an agreement with user nation or nations regarding sharing or transferring financial risk associated with executing any project. This agreement, however, will be bilateral or multilateral in nature with the host and will not affect the NATO interface with the host nation.

7. Nothing in this planning and execution system shall preclude prefinancing; in fact, it should be encouraged by the existence of a long-term plan. However, no change or adjustment to programing plans should be made as a result of prefinancing. For a prefinanced project, reimbursement will be made based on auditable real costs borne by the host nation not to exceed scope approved by NATO and at a cost no greater than that approved by NATO.

8. Organizational entities other than national MOD's which are designated to serve the host nation function for projects making up broad coordinated programs would function under the same constraints as defined for host nations under this procedure, except that the option of host nation funding of cost overruns would not be available.

Prefinancing for Collocated Operating Bases

The collocated operating base (COBS) program has been supported by the Committee in the past as an excellent way to provide better facilities in Europe for U.S. forces in a contingency. The Committee has generally approved the funding requested although the program is eligible to be funded through the NATO infrastructure account.

The House has provided $18,000,000 of the $44,000,000 requested in this budget. The Committee has disapproved the entire request. This action is taken in support of the Committee position on the continuing growth in the recoupment balance in the NATO infrastructure account. This action is not in any way a signal that the Committee does not support the COBS program.

The Committee has learned that the priority of COBS within the NATO program has not been the same priority of the U.S. Air Force. The Committee is hopeful that the Air Force and NATO can reach agreement as to the value and importance of the COBS.

The Committee understands that such an understanding may be near with NATO reviewing its military construction programs and providing more money for COBS. The Committee understands that NATO is considering increasing COBS by about $17,000,000 in the current slice as well as providing up to $50,000,000 for COBS as part of the mid-term review of military construction requirements in the current 5-year planning cycle.

With this increase in COBS, the Committee feels that adequate funds are available. The Committee endorses the House language on COBS and urges the Department to adhere to the House directions.

Master Restationing Plan

The Committee supports the language contained in the House report which continues to express concern over the lack of a firm financial commitment from the German government. The Congress has previously approved $18,000,000 for facilities at Vilseck, Germany, associated with the plan as originally proposed. The Committee believes that this action should show the German Government of the basic support for this program. The Committee does believe, however, that the cost of the plan should be primarily a host nation responsibility. The plan places U.S. personnel in forward deployment areas which permits defense at the German frontier rather than deep into the interior. In addition, the plan will place U.S. personnel into the types of facilities so badly needed throughout Germany. The plan could also prove beneficial to the German Government through the return of valuable real estate from existing military bases. The Committee hopes that the Defense Department will continue to pursue this plan with the Committee's thoughts in mind.

Security of Nuclear Weapons

The Committee is pleased to learn of the progress being made between the Defense Department and NATO regarding this extremely important program. As the House has stated, the Committee expects this program to move forward without further delay. The Committee has approved the projects authorized for this program, but expects prompt action to recoup these moneys through NATO infrastructure.

Ground-Launched Cruise Missile

The Committee has continually supported the deployment of the ground-launched cruise missile. The Committee continues to support this new weapons system as a vital part of the defense of Europe.

The Committee is aware that various reductions have been taken by the authorization committees regarding the funding of projects which should be paid out of nonappropriated funds. The Committee supports such reductions as prudent budget decisions. The House has taken reductions for these projects but has also deleted funds for family housing and dependent schools at the GLCM sites.

The Committee has supported the House positions on the amount of funds. The Committee believes that discussions on arms reductions might have an impact on GLCM; however, the Committee has not provided the funds for family facilities because of growing concern over the ever-increasing number of dependents in Europe. The Congress has consistently expressed concern over the number of dependents in Europe and yet, with each new mission, there comes more requests for family support. The Committee feels that a review of this policy must be made and will hold hearings on this matter during the next budget cycle.

Persian Gulf/Indian Ocean

The Committee fully supports the continued development of facilities in the Persian Gulf/Indian Ocean as a vital part of our plan for security in the Middle East. The Committee has provided funds at the amounts noted for projects at the following locations:

Diego Garcia	$90,700,000
Oman	28,600,000
Morocco	25,000,000

With the appropriation of the funds noted above, the Committee will have funded over $1,000,000,000 for facilities to support the Rapid Deployment Force. The Committee continues to believe that this is money well spent, but urges the Defense Department to seek host nation support where it may be appropriate.

Ras Banas, Egypt.—In the conference on the fiscal year 1983 military construction appropriation bill, the agreement was reached to allow $91,000,000 to be provided for facilities at Ras Banas, Egypt. None of these funds has been obligated and because of recent developments taken by the Egyptian Government, the House rescinded the $91,000,000 during its consideration of this bill.

The Committee has disagreed with the House rescission. The Committee recognizes the importance that the Department of Defense places on this facility. It is unfortunate that the laws of the two countries have conflicted and prolonged the negotiations to proceed with the construction.

The Committee is aware that detailed negotiations have recently taken place with high-level Egyptian and United States officials concerning the construction program at Ras Banas. While the Committee has not at this time received a definite plan on what the U.S. role in this construction project will be, the Committee is hopeful that an agreement can be reached in a matter of a few weeks.

To show the Committee's continued support of the need for this facility, the recommendation for a rescission by the House has been deleted from this bill. The Committee is recommending that $55,000,000 of the amount appropriated for Ras Banas in fiscal year 1983 remain available for future requirements at this location. However, none of the funds appropriated for Ras Banas may be obligated without written approval by the Committees on Appropriations after receipt of a detailed plan showing exactly what the U.S. role in this base will be.

The remaining $36,000,000 approved in fiscal year 1983 for the Ras Banas facilities has been taken as a general reduction to the Air Force military construction account for fiscal year 1984.

The Committee expects to be kept informed of the progress on the negotiations with the Egyptian Government. The entire matter will be a matter of discussion at the time of conference with the House.

Caribbean Basin

The Committee believes, as does the House, that the expansion of U.S. access in the Caribbean Basin represents a new and vital direction to defense planning. The Committee urges the Department to present to the appropriate committees the long-range plans for this region.

The Committee has supported those projects authorized for this region including funds for La Ceiba Airfield in Honduras. (See Air Force section of this report for further language on the Honduras program.)

The Committee believes that a policy of developing access into the Caribbean Basin is an important new initiative and urges the Department of Defense to keep the Congress fully informed on all aspects of this program.

Stimulating U.S. Business Overseas

The Committee strongly endorses the language included in the House report regarding American contractor preference in overseas locations. The Committee worked with the House in the past to provide an ability for U.S. firms to compete in the Persian Gulf/Indian Ocean area. The Committee has learned that this preference has provided six major construction projects amounting to about $750,000,000 which have gone to American firms. The projects have all been funded within the amount appropriated.

As stated in the House report, the American preference program may be applicable in other areas outside the Persian Gulf. One such area is the Pacific where a large amount of military construction is continually underway. The Committee is aware that in some instances status of forces agreements may preclude American preference. However, every effort should be made by the Department of Defense and the Department of State to work within the Committee guidelines. The Committee believes that the direction contained in the House report stating the criteria to be followed for American preference in the Pacific is adequate and endorses it as presented.

Subcontracting.—The Committee supports the position it took last year regarding subcontracting with preference to American firms. The Department of Defense is to make every effort to work with the program and, at the same time, follow prudent contracting procedures.

Program standardization.—The Department needs to implement a standard policy for the individual services to follow with regard to the American preference program. In particular, the definition of an American contractor should be part of a DOD regulation. The Committee believes that the Department should carefully review and consider the

definition of an American contractor which is used by the Agency for International Development in its construction program.

The Committee understands that the Department of Defense considers the expansion of the American preference program as a handicap in its implementation of construction programs. The Committee will be glad to receive testimony from the Department during the fiscal year 1985 budget hearings as to the impact of the procedures suggested by this program.

MX Missile Program

The Committee has provided the authorized level of $72,000,000 for facilities in support of the deployment of the MX missile system. The Committee has taken this position because of the need to proceed with these facilities as soon as possible. The Committee does, however, place a restriction on the funds. That restriction is that none of the funds appropriated for MX missile construction contained within this act may be obligated or expended until funds for the procurement of the MX missile system have been authorized by the Congress.

For several reasons, the Committee does not believe that this restriction will have any impact on the initial operational capability (IOC) of the MX system. The IOC of December 1986 has been reaffirmed in the Omnibus Defense Authorization Act, 1984, as well as a requirement that the environmental impact statement be completed in January 1984. In addition, the Committee agrees with the House that planning and design may begin on site-specific projects at F. E. Warren Air Force Base as of the effective date of this bill. Previously, the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations allowed design of facilities outside the deployment area to begin.

A general provision included in this act last year has been revised by the House and the Committee agrees. The provision prohibits construction on site-specific projects until all terms and requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332) are met. The Committee understands that the Air Force will meet these terms with the completion of the environmental impact statement at F. E. Warren Air Force Base.

It is the Committee's intention to provide the necessary facilities for this important leg of the triad, and it is also the Committee's intent to insure that the MX program is fully supported by the Congress before construction funds are obligated.

The Committee expects the Department to provide a detailed submission on all military construction requirements for the MX system in the latest basing mode. The House has required a master plan for MX construction to include such issues as hardening and/or superhardening, use of existing facilities, and site acquisition.

The Committee has taken this course of action to allow for the MX program to proceed without delays caused by lack of construction funds. The Department should work with the Committee on Appropriations to insure that all information requested is provided on a timely basis.

22-780 O - 83 - 2

Quality of Life

The Committee continues to support the need for improvements in the living and working conditions of our military personnel. Even in a time of limited resources, the Committee has realized the importance of facilities as a key to readiness.

The Committee has funded those projects deemed appropriate and which are authorized. The Committee fully understands that in preparing the military construction budgets each of the services must come up with a "balanced" program which allows for the vital operational-type projects as well as the quality of life projects which are so very important to the dependents as well as the active members.

Adequate housing for our unaccompanied personnel appears to be one of the most urgently needed areas of concern. The Committee supports the House language which suggests that the Department program more facilities to house these personnel.

The Committee, with few exceptions, has provided the budget requested levels for family housing, child care centers, family service centers, recreational facilities and other quality of life projects. It is indeed difficult at times for the Committee to approve funding for a gymnasium when a maintenance shop on the same installation needs to be replaced. The Committee at such times must give the benefit of the doubt to the services that there "balanced" programs are truly "balanced." The Committee believes, however, that it is not in the best interest of the services to lobby for specific quality of life projects which have failed authorization. The Committee will give every project in conference equal consideration.

Medical Program

As mentioned in the House report and the Senate Armed Services report, the Defense Department has a multibillion dollar backlog in medical facility improvements. While the budget has generally requested about $500,000,000 annually to cut into this backlog, the past 2 years have shown decreases in this area. The Committee will consider any reasonable method to begin to decrease this huge backlog. Particularly interesting is the proposal as mentioned in previous Committee reports of incrementally funding of those projects which cost over $100,000,000. Another method to consider is the sharing of facilities. The House has made reference to Veterans Administration sharing as well as with the private sector. The Committee hopes that the Department is considering such proposals at overseas locations and not just within the United States. The House has directed that a report on such a plan should be provided and the Committee strongly endorses the House directive.

Regarding incremental funding, the Committee supports the language included by the House which was a result of a conference agreement in fiscal year 1980. With limited resources and ever increasing requirements, the Department should carefully consider the proposals for this type of funding.

Energy

The Committee has supported the House and approved all funds authorized for energy conservation. The Committee strongly endorses the continued efforts by the Defense Department to achieve a 20-percent energy consumption reduction goal by 1985.

The Committee believes that any conservation project which has a reasonable recoupment period should be programed at the earliest possible time. The Defense Department, as the largest user of energy throughout the Government, has a responsibility to make a concerted effort to decrease energy dollars.

Solar.—10 U.S.C. 2852 requires that all military construction and family housing construction projects be reviewed to determine if the use of solar energy is practical and economically feasible. While in most instances active solar energy systems do not meet the requirements, there are 33 projects included in the fiscal year 1984 program which have active solar applications and most of the new family housing uses some form of passive solar application. The Department is to continue to work in the solar area and apply it where appropriate.

Geothermal.—The Committee, as with solar, urges the Department to continue the development of geothermal energy resources where available. The Navy has been successful at China Lake, Calif., and Fallon Naval Air Station, Nev., in the use of geothermal energy. This program can provide an inexpensive and reliable source of power.

Accuracy of Estimates

The House has included language in their report which discusses the accuracy of estimates. The Committee is aware of the problems faced when trying to estimate for a project which may not be programed for 2 years. It appears to have been most difficult during the period when inflation was running at all-time high levels and interest rates were nearing 20 percent.

The House has made note that area cost factors used by the Department are outdated. The Committee has discussed this with the Department and believes that the area cost factors are used properly to determine actual costs in areas where these factors apply. The Committee has restored the majority of the reductions made on individual projects based on this rationale.

The Committee makes note that if costs are to be truly adjusted to areas then the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act should be taken into consideration and revised. It has been estimated that the Davis-Bacon Act increases the costs for military construction projects by 10 percent. The Committee requests that the Department urge changes in Davis-Bacon as appropriate.

In the area of supervision, inspection, and overhead, the Committee believes that the Department should carefully look at the costs associated with this work. The House has recommended a uniform rate to be applied worldwide and has made reductions to the bill on that basis. The Committee has restored the reductions because a uniform rate is

not practical since it would then not provide the true costs associated with individual projects.

Planning and Design

The Committee has provided the full budget request for planning and design accounts for all of the services and defense agencies. The Committee strongly believes that the funds provided in this account are well spent in that, by having design at the 35-percent level or higher, the budget request is as accurate as possible.

The Committee is concerned with findings as mentioned in the House over such items as the potential liability of architect and engineer firms in design error and/or deficiency and in contract modifications and change orders. As mentioned by the House, the Department's best interests are served by careful overview of the planning and design account.

Small business set-asides for architect engineer contracts.—For the past 2 years, the Committee has heard testimony on the problems faced by architect engineer firms and the rules concerning small business set-asides. As appropriate, the Senate Armed Services Committee has, after careful review and with some hesitation, imposed a set-aside level in permanent law. This has been done because the Department has failed to establish guidelines on the matter.

The Committee strongly supports the language and provision recommended by the Senate Armed Services Committee. The Committee will continue to monitor this situation as it applies to the appropriated funds for the planning and design account.

Planning and design of military museums.—The Committee believes that the House language concerning design of museums out of nonappropriated funds is not appropriate. In some instances, it may be necessary to move an existing facility or museum to make room for expansion or new projects. These requests should be considered on a one-by-one basis. The Committee directs that the use of planning and design funds for museums in any amount be subject to the existing policy regarding reporting the expenditure of planning and design funds.

Reductions for Good Bids

The Committee has supported the position taken by the Senate Armed Services Committee in recommending nearly $450,000,000 in projects to be funded from within available savings. These savings have become available because of the unusually good bidding climate brought on during 1981 before economic recovery had begun. Due to the fact that most cost estimates for military construction projects are prepared up to 2 years in advance, those estimates reflected the high inflation rates of the time.

All of the projects listed below are valid requirements which were programed for out-year budgets but which can be awarded during fiscal year 1984 if funds are available.

The Department of Defense is to request funds for these projects as was done with the projects approved for funding in this same manner

as part of the fiscal year 1983 bill. In addition, the Department is to comply with the requirements set forth by the authorization committee. The projects are to be funded only with savings available from the fiscal year 1983 and prior-year appropriations.

The projects recommended are as follows:

Army:	
Fort Huachuca, Ariz.: Brigade headquarters	$1,500,000
Fort Carson, Colo.: Operations building	2,000,000
Rock Island Arsenal, Ill.: Bridge repair	4,500,000
Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind.: UEPH	5,900,000
Fort Devens, Mass.: Child care center	3,000,000
Fort Sill, Okla.: UEPH	23,000,000
Fort Jackson, S.C.:	
Education center	5,200,000
Chapel/child care center	6,400,000
Trainee barracks	26,800,000
Fort Bliss, Tex.:	
Physical fitness training center	2,850,000
Infantry remote target systems ranges	3,000,000
Fort Hood, Tex.:	
Bradley vehicle range	3,350,000
Bulk fuel storage	4,200,000
Fort Lewis, Wash.:	
Hangar addition	2,800,000
Instrument landing system	870,000
Family housing, Europe	40,000,000
Navy:	
Naval Submarine Base, Kings Bay, Ga: TRIDENT training facility	81,700,000
Air Force:	
Gunter AFB, Ala.: UEPH (2)	5,000,000
Galena Airport, Alaska:	
Composite operations	3,700,000
Composite support facility	5,700,000
Williams AFB, Ariz.: Addition to EMCS	2,000,000
Edwards AFB, Calif.: RAPCON/CCF facility	490,000
McClellan AFB, Calif.:	
Depot facility	3,500,000
Inspection facility	5,900,000
Norton AFB, Calif.: Access road and bridge	6,400,000
Lowry AFB, Colo.: Classroom facility	6,100,000
Tyndall AFB, Fla.:	
UOPH	4,600,000
UEPH	4,500,000
Civil engineering science lab	4,650,000
Education center	2,000,000
Base support center	6,500,000
Robins AFB, Ga.: Alterations to UEPH	1,450,000
Chanute AFB, Ill.: Heat plant	11,700,000
Grissom AFB, Ind.:	
Personnel support center	5,600,000
Dining hall	3,200,000
Vehicle maintenance shop	1,030,000
K. I. Sawyer AFB, Mich.: Addition to heat plant	35,000,000
Columbus AFB, Miss.: PMEL	530,000

Air Force—Continued	
Keesler AFB, Miss.:	
Computer training facility	11,900,000
UEPH with dining hall	6,400,000
Whiteman AFB, Mo.:	
UEPH (2)	8,200,000
Dining hall	3,300,000
Heating plant	1,800,000
Vehicle maintenance facility	2,000,000
Offutt AFB, Nebr.: UOPH	4,000,000
Pease AFB, N.H.: Base civil engineering complex	7,200,000
Cannon AFB, N. Mex.: Consolidated support center	6,800,000
Holloman AFB, N. Mex.:	
Addition to aircraft maintenance unit	600,000
Addition to engine instrument repair shop	1,000,000
Aircraft corrosion control facility	1,400,000
Alter UEPH	3,100,000
Dining hall	3,000,000
Aircraft maintenance hangar	7,700,000
Munitions storage	3,700,000
Pope AFB, N.C.: Base transportation complex	3,700,000
Tinker AFB, Okla.:	
Alter F–107 engine facility	420,000
Combat communications headquarters	720,000
Communications/electronics facility	960,000
Charleston AFB, S.C.: Composite wing facility	3,200,000
Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tenn.: Bulk fuel fire protection	382,000
Bergstrom AFB, Tex.:	
Base support center	6,500,000
Composite wing facility	1,280,000
Education center	2,750,000
Access road	3,000,000
Carswell AFB, Tex.: Upgrade powerplants ADWS	710,000
Goodfellow AFB, Tex.:	
Alter electrical distribution system	1,600,000
Voice processing training facility	7,800,000
Lackland AFB, Tex.: Chapel	2,900,000
Sheppard AFB, Tex.: Gym	3,180,000
Fairchild AFB, Wash.:	
Alter UEPH	5,000,000
Rehabilitate personnel office	1,100,000
UEPH	8,500,000
Dining facility	3,730,000

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

Fiscal year 1983 appropriation	$929,720,000
Fiscal year 1984 request	1,375,000,000
House allowance	1,215,565,000
Committee recommendation	1,142,040,000

The Committee is recommending an appropriation of $1,142,040,000 for the Army for fiscal year 1984. This amount reflects a decrease of $232,960,000 to the budget request and a decrease to the House proposal in the amount of $73,525,000.

Specific program changes in the Committee recommendation are discussed below: (See project listing at the end of the report for complete program recommendations.)

AUTHORIZATION REDUCTIONS

House adds.—The following projects were added by the House but have not been authorized by the Senate and, therefore, are not recommended by the Committee:

Maryland: Aberdeen Proving Ground—UEPH	$9,800,000
Massachusetts: Fort Devens—Child care center	3,000,000
Oklahoma: Fort Sill—UEPH	23,000,000
Texas: Fort Hood:	
Bradley vehicle range	3,350,000
Bulk fuel storage	4,200,000

Budgeted projects.—The following projects were requested as part of the budget but have not been authorized by the Senate and, therefore, are not recommended by the Committee:

Arkansas: Pine Bluff Arsenal—Chemical agent disposal facility	$10,200,000
California:	
Fort Hunter Liggett—Physcial fitness training center	2,850,000
Fort Irwin:	
Barracks modernization	7,700,000
Modernize various facilities	2,100,000
Kansas:	
Fort Leavenworth—UOPH (partial reduction)	14,000,000
Fort Riley:	
Barracks	6,300,000
Barracks	4,500,000
Barracks with dining facility	8,400,000
Electrical substation	1,400,000
Sewage treatment and water upgrade	6,500,000
Kentucky: Fort Campbell—Solid waste incinerator	4,950,000
Maryland: Aberdeen Proving Ground—Medical research lab alterations	3,650,000
New Jersey: Fort Monmouth—Pulse power center	12,400,000

Pennsylvania:	
Carlisle barracks—Gym with pool	$3,700,000
Letterkenny Army Depot—Heat recovery incinerator	1,600,000
Tobyhanna Army Depot—Shelter handling facility	9,200,000
Virginia: Fort Eustis—Steam plant addition	3,400,000
Various: Access roads	500,000
Germany:	
Various locations—Ammunition storage	11,260,000
Finthen—Dining facility	980,000
Hanau—Parking area (partical reduction)	2,400,000
Heilbronn:	
Barracks modernization	930,000
Battalion headquarters	1,550,000
Tactical equipment shop	1,700,000
Nuernberg—Automatic temperature controls	380,000
Rheinberg—Purchase of support facilities	16,500,000
Stuttgart—Heat recovery system	630,000
Wuerzberg—Dental clinic	2,000,000
Greece: Various locations—Miscellaneous facilities	4,880,000
Korea: Operations building	150,000

OTHER PROGRAM CHANGES

Fort Irwin, Calif., outdoor courts and fields; physical fitness training center.—The Committee recommends the full budget request for both of these facilities. The House deleted the physical fitness training center; the Committee recommends $5,800,000 for this facility which will provide gymnasium facilities for nearly 3,000 permanently assigned personnel at Fort Irwin. The project for the outdoor courts and fields costing $2,400,000 provides 39 areas for various activities. Due to the desert environment at Fort Irwin, the project provides water service, irrigation, parking, sidewalks, fencing, and, where necessary, lighting for off-duty night playing. Fort Irwin is the location of the Army's National Training Center. It is a relatively remote area with desert climate. The Committee feels that these facilities are critical for the morale of the personnel at Fort Irwin.

Fort Ord, Calif., water wells.—The House denied this project because a regional water source study is planned. The Committee recommends $3,200,000 for the project because local water supplies are not available and because the regional study is to develop long-range water supply alternatives and solutions. The existing wells cannot support this installation which has grown considerably since the wells were drilled.

Sierra Army Depot, Calif., physical fitness training center.—The Committee recommends $2,200,000 for this facility which the House reduced to $1,000,000. However, the Committee believes that the House was correct in that the project appears to be overscoped for this small installation. The Committee believes that a review of the project prior to conference with the House will provide a satisfactory compromise.

Fort Carson, Colo., fencing.—The Committee supports the budget request of $890,000 for this project to fence 240,000 acres at Fort Carson. The project was authorized in fiscal year 1983 based on section 912(b) of the Fiscal Year 1982 Military Construction Authorization Act (Public Law 97-99). The fencing is required as an integral part of the Fort Carson range management program which is a significant part of the miti-

gation measures described in the environmental impact statement regarding the facility. Colorado is an open grazing State and lands are protected only if fenced to keep livestock out. The range management program requires control over these lands at all times, but especially during the rest and regrowth periods. The Committee believes this project to be a good investment in protecting this valuable land.

Rock Island Arsenal, Ill., modernize manufacturing facility (REARM).—The House recommends $22,000,000 for this important facility. The House denied $9,000,000 of the Army's request for REARM construction and requires the $9,000,000 of the $22,000,000 to be funded by foreign military sales receipts. The denial was based on 40 percent of the production dedicated to foreign military sales (FMS); therefore, receipts from the military sales program should be applied toward the construction costs.

Rock Island Arsenal is the only production facility of its type in the United States. The REARM project is not based on FMS production requirements, but rather on the need to permit the facility to produce more efficiently in meeting DOD's peacetime production needs and to allow it to meet U.S. mobilization requirements. The project will shorten the time necessary to meet full mobilization capacity from 22 months to 6 months.

The House conclusion that "more than 40 percent of the production rate of this facility is dedicated to FMS" is incorrect. There is no weapon production at this arsenal dedicated to FMS, nor will any be so dedicated after REARM is completed. FMS production is the arsenal's lowest priority, and those orders are generally filled only after the needs of U.S. forces are met. In some instances, FMS production has even been delayed in order to insure that the U.S. requirements are satisfied.

FMS does assist, however, in helping the arsenal meet its objective of fulfilling its mission in the most efficient and least expensive manner. It does this in two principal ways. First, by inserting FMS orders between the irregular placement of U.S. orders, the arsenal insures continuity in production operations rather than experiencing the repeated stopping and starting. Second, because FMS requires producing greater numbers of a particular item than is necessary to meet U.S. needs, the unit cost of each item is lower.

FMS customers also pay various surcharges to insure that these sales are at the full cost to the customer and not subsidized by the U.S. Government. In addition to the surcharges for administrative services and nonrecurring costs of research, development, and production, there is one to cover the value added to a particular article through the use of U.S. plant and production equipment (22 U.S.C. 2761(e)). In the past, this asset use charge has gone into the miscellaneous receipts of the U.S. Treasury. Recently, Congress directed it go into a special revolving fund for purchasing and storing defense articles with long production lead times in anticipation of their future transfer to foreign customers (22 U.S.C. 2795(b)). Thus, there is a means for recouping an FMS customer's fair share of these capital investment costs, but there is no money available now to pay up front for those costs.

The House has referred to a similar action it took with respect to an Air Force construction request in 1980. The comparison is inappropriate, however, because of significant factual distinction. The Air Force's request was for $1,100,000 for Wright-Patterson AFB to house a headquarters activity for the management of foreign military sales. Thus, the sole purpose of the AF's request was to meet an FMS requirement. The contrary is true for the REARM program, for as noted above, the program is to meet a DOD requirement, with its availability for FMS production being only incidental.

U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y.—Land acquisition, Ladycliff.—The Committee has deferred without prejudice the $3,450,000 requested for this project to purchase 33 acres of land adjacent to West Point. The Committee has taken this action because of the proposed out-year costs involved in this purchase which are estimated at more than $45,000,000. The Committee understands that the land and buildings are presently under a lease with an option to purchase and no cost escalation is involved in the purchase price during the lease period. The Committee will review the project justification prior to conference with the House.

Fort Bliss, Tex., DIVAD training range.—The Committee has approved the funds for this project. The $9,000,000 will provide for an adequate range on which training can be accomplished using the DIVAD system. The Committee has noted, however, the language contained in the Senate Omnibus Defense Authorization Act, 1984, regarding funds for the DIVAD. The Committee believes that with the concern over production of this system that none of the funds appropriated for this project should be obligated until such time as the Secretary of the Army has certified to the Committees on Appropriation that the report requested by the Armed Services Committee has been submitted and the production for fiscal year 1984 has been authorized to proceed at that time.

Fischbach and Kirchgoens, Germany/Camp Red Cloud, Korea, skill development centers.—The House denied these projects as being expensive craft shops or video arcades and stated they should be funded out of nonappropriated funds. The Senate has restored the projects. Because these locations are outside the United States, they are eligible for appropriated funding. In addition, each of these sites is remote and it is in the best interest of the personnel to provide wholesome off-duty leisure activity as an alternative to alcohol and drug abuse. The Committee would suggest, however, that in the future the Army more correctly title the projects as recreation centers.

Camp Darby, Italy, care and preservation building.—The Committee recommends $2,350,000 for this project denied by the House. The facility will provide adequate space to permit proper care and preservation of material long sorted at Camp Darby for U.S. unilateral contingencies in the Mediterranean area and/or Southwest Asia. The Committee does not support the concept that the project is NATO eligible since the project is a national requirement.

Korea, various locations, communications center.—The Committee approves $2,20,000 for this project which is for sole use of U.S. forces and ties into a jointly funded Korean-United States Backbone communications system. The centers will be built at locations where no Korean facility exists.

Kwajalein Island multipurpose recreation facility.—The House reduced the scope of the project from $3,550,000 to $1,500,000. The Committee recommends the budget request of $3,550,000. The facility will provide for 3,000 personnel stationed at this remote location in the Pacific Ocean. It is not likely that cost can be reduced due to the fact that all construction materials must be imported.

General reduction.—Due to budgetary constraints placed on the Committee, a general reduction of $38,950,000 has been taken from the Army account.

Minor construction.—The Committee supports the budget request of $32,000,000 for this account which covers both exigent or unspecified minor construction. The House reduction was based on an authorization cut. The authorization reduction was taken because adequate prior authorization had not been funded.

Mobilization planning and design.—The Committee recommends $13,000,000 for this account which will provide funds to develop a series of standard mobilization facilities designs (M drawings). The drawings will not be site-specific. Part of the funds will be used by Army commanders to site-adapt the designs to meet the construction needs essential to their mobilization missions including unique, technical, long-leadtime projects such as utility systems, special medical needs, et cetera. All of these designs are needed to put the facilities into operation during the first 6 months of mobilization. The budget request is an investment in reducing response time deficiency by 90 days in time of mobilization.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky/Tennessee excess land.—The Committee has been made aware that the Army has made land available to the local community at Fort Campbell to be used as a landfill. The Committee directs the Army to cooperate fully with the General Services Administration in completing the free transfer of this land to the city of Clarksville, Tenn.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky/Tennessee tactical equipment shops.—The Committee recognizes the increased need for organizational level maintenance facilities attributing to force modernization and division 86/ Army 90. Acceleration of efforts at Fort Campbell is desired to insure a high state of combat readiness of the 101st Airborne Division (air assault) assigned to the 18th Airborne Corps. This corps is the major component of the Rapid Deployment Force (RDF).

The MCA program for Fort Campbell, including fiscal year 1983, provides 49 percent (195,986 SF of 393,676 SF requirement) of the installation's total requirement in terms of adequate permanent shop space. The remaining need is stressed by the use of World War II obsolete, deteriorated facilities (139,981 SF), maintenance tents, and performance of certain heavy equipment unit maintenance in the open.

Two fiscal year 1987 projects which need to be accelerated are:

Project number and title	*Program AMT*
321 Tactical equipment shop—DIVARTY	$8,473,000
353 Tactical equipment shop—DIVARTY	9,000,000

The Committee desires that the Army initiate design on these projects so that they could be included in the fiscal year 1985 Army construction program.

Pine Bluff Arsenal, Ark.—Chemical agent disposal facility.—The Committee fully supports the Army's request for this facility; however, at the time this bill was reported to the Senate, no authorization had been provided. Therefore, to conform to the authorization bill, no funds are recommended. The Committee is aware that this $10,200,000 project is vital to meet the need of disposing of outdated chemicals in the Army's inventory with the introduction of binary chemical weapons. The Committee understands that during conference action on the authorization bill the Senate will recede to the House on this project. This Committee would strongly endorse such action and take similar action at the time of conference with the House on this bill.

Carlisle Barracks, Pa.—Physical fitness training center with pool.—The Committee has deleted $3,700,000 for construction of a building to house a swimming pool at the Carlisle Army Barracks, home to the War College. The Committee was unable to approve the $3,700,000 requested for this project since Senate authorization has not included it. Nonetheless, after careful review of the project the Committee is convinced of its necessity and expects that work will be funded to the fullest extent possible.

Tobyhanna Army Depot, Pa.—Shelter handling facility.—The Committee fully supports the Army's proposed construction for the Tobyhanna Army Depot in Pennsylvania. However, since it is not yet clear whether the $9,200,000 requested for the project will be authorized for expenditure this year, funds have not been included by the Committee in its bill at this time. It is, however, the Committee's hope that the project will be able to proceed as planned during the 1984 fiscal year.

Military Construction, Navy

Fiscal year 1983 appropriation	$1,080,750,000
Fiscal year 1984 request	1,343,700,000
House allowance	1,181,905,000
Committee recommendation	1,232,506,000

The Committee is recommending $1,232,506,000 for Navy and Marine Corps military construction projects in fiscal year 1984. This amount reflects an increase of $50,601,000 to the House approved amount and a decrease of $111,194,000 from the budget request.

Specific program changes reflected in the Committee recommendation are discussed below: (See project listing at the end of the report for complete program recommendations.)

AUTHORIZATION REDUCTIONS

House adds.—The following projects were added by the House but have not been authorized by the Senate and, therefore, are not recommended by the Committee:

California:	
NSA Mare Island—UEPH modernization	$1,800,000
NSY Mare Island:	
Paint and blast facility	6,000,000
Facility energy improvements	1,600,000
Florida:	
NCSC Panama City—Underwater weapons lab	5,400,000
NTTC Pensacola—Chapel	2,200,000
NAS Pensacola—Runway improvements	2,200,000
Hawaii: NSY Pearl Harbor:	
Training facility	4,600,000
Service shops	20,000,000
Pennsylvania:	
NSY Philadelphia—Berthing wharf improvements	2,600,000
NSSES Philadelphia—Evaluation test facility	14,500,000
Virginia:	
FCTC Dam Neck—Applied instruction building	12,200,000
NSY Norfolk—Electrical distribution system modernization	10,500,000
Washington; NUSWES Keyport—Station access facility	1,400,000

Budgeted projects.—The following projects were requested as part of the budget but have not been authorized by the Senate and, therefore, are not recommended by the Committee:

Alaska: Naval Security Group Adak:	
Electronics storage	$2,000,000
Public works storage	1,490,000
California: NARF Alameda—Engine test cell modifications	4,740,000
Connecticut:	
NSB New London:	
Quaywalls	3,770,000
UEPH improvements	870,000
NSB Medical Center New London—Hospital expansion	6,510,000
NSS New London:	
Applied instruction building	7,340,000
Operational trainer facility	4,840,000
Florida:	
NAS Whiting field—Land acquisition	990,000
Naval Ordnance Test Unit Cape Canaveral—TRIDENT II flight test facility (partial reduction)	3,400,000
Georgia: NSB Kings Bay—Floating drydock mooring facility	8,600,000
Hawaii: Fleet Intell, Center Pearl Harbor—Standby generator plant (partial reduction)	833,000
Maryland: Naval Academy—Boat basin improvements	3,070,000
New Jersey: Fort Dix Aegis Site—UEPH with dining facility	2,040,000
Pennsylvania: NSPCC Mechanicsburg—Data processing center	15,800,000
Rhode Island: NETC Newport—Pier utilities	3,160,000
Diego Garcia: Various community facilities (partial reduction)	2,000,000
Greece: NCS Nea Makri—Receiver building	4,930,000
Iceland:	
NS Keflavik:	
Combined operations center	4,650,000
Fueling pier	44,400,000
General warehouse	4,180,000

Italy: NAS Sigonella:	
AFRTS station	$1,350,000
Gym addition and theatre	2,420,000
Japan: FLEACTS Okinawa—Family service center	680,000
Panama: NS Panama—UEPH	1,490,000
United Kingdom: NSA Holy Loch:	
Family service center	600,000
General warehouse	3,120,000
Medical/dental clinic	2,830,000
Supply pier	3,260,000

OTHER PROGRAM CHANGES

Inflated costs.—The House made several individual reductions to projects citing concern about inflated costs. The Navy has advised the Committee of its review of these projects and provided the Committee with a current working estimate for the facilities. The Committee recommends the following projects at the amount shown:

NWC China Lake, Calif.—Radiographic inspection facility	$12,240,000
NSB San Diego, Calif.—UOPH	3,700,000
NS Mayport, Fla.—UOPH	3,400,000

Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado, Calif.—Land craft air cushion complex (Camp Pendleton).—The House reduced the budget request for this project because it felt that the total program cost of $130,000,000 for both east and west coast sites to be excessive. The Committee has restored the House cut because the $21,200,000 requested is justified to support the first six craft upon their arrival at Coronado (homeport) in fiscal year 1986.

Tactical training group, Pacific, San Diego, Calif.; and tactical training group, Atlantic, Virginia Beach, Va.—Operational training facilities.—The Committee recommends $7,010,000 for these two projects which were deleted by the House on the grounds that their functions could be fulfilled in other existing space. Other space is not available at these locations to properly accommodate the short leadtime computerized battle group tactical training equipment to be procured in fiscal year 1985 while also conducting and supporting classwork at the special compartmental intelligence (SCI) level.

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Fla.—Maintenance hanger.—The House denied this project on the basis that the F/A–18 aircraft based at Cecil Field could make use of the existing hangars vacated by the A–7 squadrons. The Committee has restored the House reduction of $7,500,000 because the Navy has fully justified the project. The A–7 hangars will be used to house the F/A–18 eventually as they are phased out. However, due to an increase in the number of aircraft carriers in the Atlantic fleet, there will be four additional attack squadrons assigned to Cecil Field. Thus, the need for the hangars exists now.

David W. Taylor Naval Ship Research and Development Center, Bethesda, Md.—Computation and analysis laboratory.—The House denied this project pending the submission of a master plan for the center. The Committee has the master plan and believes the project to be fully justified. The project is approved at $5,030,000.

National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md.—Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing (UEPH).—The Committee has restored the $1,370,000 deleted by the House from this project. The House reduction was made to reflect the removal of a covered parking garage from the project. Due to limited space at this installation, the parking garage is an integral part of the project. The living quarters for the enlisted personnel actually are on top of the garage. The siting and design for this facility has been approved by the National Capital Planning Commission.

Naval Shipyard Portsmouth, Norfolk, Va.—Steam plan (phase II).—The Committee has learned from the Navy that this project is of a highly technical nature. Current cost estimates are exceeding the authorized level (fiscal year 1983) and the full funding is required. The House reduced the project by $8,000,000; this amount is restored by the Committee.

Naval Air Station, Sigonella, Italy—Utilities improvements.—The House reduced this project stating that part of the cost should be a host nation responsibility. The Committee supports the budget request of $5,090,000 and the Navy position that Italy has fulfilled its basic host nation responsibility. Much of the base consists of U.S. personnel support and other facilities built through U.S. military construction funds because they were not NATO eligible. Therefore, utilities improvements to these areas is a U.S. responsibility.

Naval activities, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines—Various facilities.—The Committee has restored the $7,860,000 for facilities at Subic Bay. The House had deferred these projects since they were not authorized by the House. Since that time, a new basing rights agreement has been signed and the Senate has authorized the projects at this important location.

Atlantic Fleet Weapons Training Facility, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico—Range operations center and land acquisition.—The House denied the $1,945,000 request for these projects until the Navy performs an in-depth need analysis of its east coast training range requirements. The Navy has informed the Committee that this facility is essential over the long term to maintain readiness of the Atlantic Fleet. The Committee supports the request.

Host nation infrastructure support, various locations.—The Committee has restored the $2,970,000 requested for this support which was deleted by the House. The Committee believes this is a valid request and our requirement as the host nation to NATO infrastructure facilities in U.S. bases.

General reduction.—Due to budgetary constraints placed on the Committee, a general reduction of $19,145,000 is being recommended for the Navy.

Minor construction.—The Committee approves the budget request for this account at $22,000,000. This amount supports the Navy's need to manage urgent requirements as noted in the 1982 Codification Act on military construction. While the amount requested is $4,000,000 more than last year's appropriation, it is still $1,600,000 below the fiscal year 1982 appropriation.

Authorization additions.—The Senate has authorized several high priority projects which were not included in the budget request. The Committee supports these projects and has appropriated the following amounts:

Fleet Training Center, San Diego: Applied instruction building	$10,000,000
NAS Key West, Fla.: Air combat manuevering range	11,800,000
NSY Portsmouth, N.H./Maine:	
Ventilation improvements	1,400,000
Fire protection	5,700,000
NSY Charleston, S.C.: Electrical distribution system improvements	15,000,000
NS Charleston, S.C.: Fire protection pipeline	3,900,000
NSY Puget Sound, Washington: UEPH	7,300,000

Naval ordnance plant, Louisville, Ky.—The Committee is aware of the Navy's ongoing negotiations to acquire property adjacent to the Naval Ordnance Station in Louisville. The Committee understands that such a purchase would save the Government several million dollars as compared with new construction. The Navy is encouraged to proceed with this acquisition and to consider a lease with option to buy if it is not possible to put the project in a near-term military construction budget.

Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tenn.—The Committee has approved full funding for the $11,800,000 in projects proposed at NAS Memphis. The Committee continues to view the facilities upgrade at this location as a high priority. The Committee, therefore, directs the Navy and the Naval Reserve to program military construction projects required to maintain and improve operational facilities and quality of life at NAS Memphis.

Naval shipyard, Philadelphia, Pa.—The Committee has been informed of negotiations between the city of Philadelphia and the Navy regarding construction by the city of a refuse-derived steam plant. Under the plan, the Navy would purchase steam from the city and would, therefore, not be required to construct a new plant estimated to cost $200,000,000. In addition, the new facility would reduce energy costs at the shipyard. The Committee has further been informed of the fact that both parties are near agreement prior to signing a memorandum of understanding. The Committee would encourage the Navy and the city to continue with their discussions and reach a compromise at the earliest possible time. Such an agreement would clearly be in the best interests of the Navy and at the same time help the local community.

Naval Ship Systems Engineering Station, Philadelphia, Pa.—Test and evaluation facility.—The Committee is concerned that the Navy has failed to proceed as quickly as it might in plans to rehabilitate and convert an existing industrial building, located at its Philadelphia NAVSSES site, to a testing and evaluation facility. The Committee is advised that such work has been estimated to cost $14,500,000.

No funding for this project has been included in the bill by the Committee since the status of its authorization in fiscal year 1984 has yet to be determined. However, the Committee endorses this program for its contribution to cost-effectiveness and fleet readiness and expects the Navy to proceed with work on the project at the earliest date possible.

Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, Pa.—Berthing wharf improvements.—Improvements in shipyard facilities, including expansion of utility support services, have been identified as essential to the effective berthing support at the shipyard for additional reserve frigates intended to be homeported there beginning in calendar 1983. The Navy has not requested funding for this project. However, if the Navy is to accommodate a 600-ship active fleet, essential improvements will have to be made at shipyards required to support both our active and reserve fleet vessels and personnel. It is the Committee's hope that, despite the current uncertain status of authorization for this project, work will begin at the earliest date possible.

Navy Ships Parts Control Center, Mechanicsburg, Pa.—Data processing center—The Committee fully supports the Navy's plan to proceed in fiscal year 1984 with a $15,800,000 new data processing center to improve its capability to account for the conventional weaponry, ammunition, and ship parts for which it is responsible. Funds for this program were not, however, included by the Committee in its bill at this time since authorization for the project is uncertain at this time. It is the Committee's hope that, because of the substantial contribution to Navy readiness which would result from this project, work begin at the earliest possible time.

Naval submarine base, Kings Bay, Ga.—The Committee has supported the addition of $5,619,000 in community impact assistance for the local communities surrounding this strategic base. The Committee directs the Navy to continue to work with the local communities to provide as much assistance as possible in meeting the impact of this major new installation on these rural South Georgia towns.

As noted earlier in this report, the Committee has approved the TRIDENT training facility at Kings Bay to be funded from available savings. The Committee was forced to provide funds in this manner for the project after it was deleted by the Navy just prior to submission of the fiscal year 1984 budget. In order to meet the initial operational capability of the TRIDENT east coast site, the Kings Bay construction plan must stay on course. The Committee discussed the Kings Bay construction schedule at great length with Navy officials and believes that further deletion of major projects for Kings Bay will have an adverse impact on the local communities and the overall Navy military construction budget. In addition to proceeding with the TRIDENT training facility as soon as funds are available, the Committee directs the Navy to include in its fiscal year 1985 military construction budget request the drydock project for Kings Bay. With an estimated cost of over $100,000,000 this project is essential to operations of the TRIDENT fleet on the east coast. The Committee is providing this direction to the Navy while the program budget cycle is just being started within the Defense Department. The Committee strongly believes that including this project in fiscal year 1985—as originally planned—will provide for the most logical funding and construction program.

The importance of meeting the initial operational capability (IOC) at Kings Bay cannot be stressed enough. This important strategic system is

one of the vital links to the TRIAD and our basic defense posture. In view of the continuing debate over the MX missile and other systems, the TRIDENT must not be delayed. Further disruption to the construction schedule at Kings Bay could cause the IOC at Kings Bay to slip—a slip which is not necessary if prudent programing decisions are forthcoming.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

Fiscal year 1983 appropriation	$1,551,414,000
Fiscal year 1984 request	2,300,900,000
House allowance	1,374,751,000
Committee recommendation	1,502,491,000

The Committee has recommended an appropriation of $1,538,871,000 for the Air Force in fiscal year 1984. The recommendation amounts to a decrease of $798,409,000 from the budget request and an increase to the House recommendation of $127,740,000.

Specific program changes reflected in the Committee recommendation are discussed below: (See project listing at the end of the report for complete program recommendations.)

AUTHORIZATION REDUCTIONS

House adds.—The following projects were added by the House but have not been authorized by the Senate and, therefore, are not recommended by the Committee:

Alabama: Gunter AFB—UEPH (2)	$5,000,000
California:	
McClellan AFB:	
Depot facility	3,500,000
Inspection facility	5,900,000
Norton AFB—Access road and bridge	6,400,000
Travis AFB—Medical facility	52,000,000
Illinois: Chanute AFB—Heat plant	11,700,000
Kansas: McConnell AFB:	
UEPH	5,500,000
Airfield lighting	1,230,000
Missouri: Whiteman AFB:	
UEPH (2)	8,600,000
Dining hall	3,300,000
Heating plant	1,800,000
Missile maintenance facility	7,900,000
New York: Griffis AFB—UEPH	6,700,000
Oklahoma: Altus AFB—Consolidated operations/maintenance facility	3,400,000
Texas: Goodfellow AFB—Alter electrical distribution system	1,500,000
Washington: Fairchild AFB:	
Alter UEPH	5,000,000
UEPH	8,500,000
Dining facility	3,730,000
Hydrant fueling system	4,400,000

Budgeted projects.—The following projects were requested as part of the budget but have not been authorized by the Senate and, therefore, are not recommended by the Committee:

Arizona: Williams AFB—Flight facilities maintenance shop	$500,000
Arkansas:	
Blytheville AFB—EMCS	2,120,000
Little Rock AFB—VOQ	2,850,000
California:	
Long Beach Naval Beach—Administrative facility	500,000
Vandenberg AFB—Gym addition	380,000
District of Columbia: Bolling AFB:	
Gym	3,650,000
Post office	620,000
Georgia: Robins AFB—Add to offensive avionics facility	1,350,000
Louisiana: England AFB—Administrative facility	500,000
Maryland: Andrews AFB—OSH-fire protection sprinkler system (partial reduction)	414,000
Michigan: K. I. Sawyer AFB:	
Heat plant	35,000,000
Various operations/maintenance training facilities (partial reduction)	1,000,000
Montana: Forsyth/Havre—Strategic training range—land acquisition (partial reduction)	579,000
Nevada: Nellis AFB—Relocate power line/land acquisition	175,000
New Mexico: Cannon AFB—Consolidated support center	6,800,000
New York:	
Griffis AFB—Add/alter electrical research test facility	2,250,000
Fort Hamilton—Administrative facility	500,000
North Dakota: Minot AFB:	
Composite medical facility	38,000,000
Various operations/maintenance training facilities (partial reduction)	1,000,000
Oklahoma: Tinker AFB—Clothing sales store	700,000
Tennessee: Arnold Engineering—Anechoic chamber	200,000
Texas: Laughlin AFB—Land fee purchase	2,120,000
Unspecified:	
Peacekeeper access roads	9,000,000
Peacekeeper facilities	342,000,000
OTH-B West land acquisition (partial reduction)	1,000,000
Germany: Spangdahlen AFB—Access roads/utilities	2,950,000
Greenland: Various locations—Dewline facilities	20,530,000
Guam: Anderson AFB—Arts and crafts shop	1,500,000
Italy: Comiso—GLCM facilities (partial reduction)	9,150,000
Japan: Misawa AB—Commando Port support—Phase I	29,000,000
Oman: Various RDF facilities (partial reduction)	11,000,000
Scotland: Prestwick Airfield—EDS forward storage	1,820,000
Spain: Torrejon AB—EDS forward storage	1,400,000
United Kingdom: RAF Greenham Common—GLCM facilities (partial reduction)	11,555,000
Various locations:	
GLCM facilities (third country) (partial reduction)	6,530,000
GLCM facilities (fourth country) (partial reduction)	3,840,000
GLCM facilities (fifth country)	34,015,000

OTHER PROGRAM CHANGES

Items of special interest.—Earlier in this report under items of special interest the Committee has discussed the recommendations on three programs of importance to the Air Force. These programs are as follows: ground-launched cruise missile, MX facilities, and collocated operating bases (COB's). Please refer to the other section of this report for detail on these programs.

House reductions.—The House made several reductions to the Air Force request based on House authorization reductions. The Committee

has reviewed these projects and recommends the following for appropriation: (These projects have all been authorized by the Senate.)

Elmendorf AFB, Alaska: Add to SATCOM ground terminal	$1,300,000
Shemya AFB, Alaska: Hangar	24,000,000
Vandenberg AFB, Calif.: STS-external tank area icing protection	6,600,000
Buckley ANG Base, Colo.: Commercial power connection	2,000,000
Over the horizon backscatter radar:	
Bangor, Maine—Support facilities	10,100,000
OTHB-West—Land acquisition	500,000
Offutt AFB, Nebr.: Aircraft maintenance hangar	26,900,000
Ascension Island: UOPH	4,010,000
Bitburg AB, Germany: Modify TAB VEE shelters	800,000
Ranstein AFB, Germany: Alterations to avionics shop	410,000
Zweibrucken AFB, Germany:	
European distribution systems projects—Storage warehouse	1,820,000
UEPH	2,700,000
Operations/maintenance facility	760,000
Clark AFB, Philippines: Various projects	8,940,000
Turkey, various locations: Airbase upgrade	66,700,000
United Kingdom, various locations	826,000

Administrative facilities, various locations.—The House deleted all funds requested for these facilities to be used for recruiting stations. The Committee has also denied these funds. Since recruiting stations are generally used jointly with the other services, the Committee does not understand why the Air Force is the sole branch requesting new facilities.

Eielson AFB, Alaska—Medical/dental clinic.—The Committee supports full funding of $22,220,000 for this project. The House reduced the funding request based on incorrect area cost factors. The Committee is well aware of construction costs throughout Alaska and believes the estimate provided in the budget to be correct.

Williams AFB, Ariz.—Recreation complex.—The House reduced this project on the basis that the per square foot cost was excessive. The Committee has reviewed the justification and the Air Force appeal for the project. The budget request appears to be the correct price, and the Committee recommends $1,750,000 for the project.

Los Angeles Air Force Base, Calif.—Addition and alteration to gym.—The Committee recommends $1,700,000 for this facility. This base is unusual in that it is located within the highly conjested city of Los Angeles. Adequate physical fitness facilities for our military personnel are essential for readiness, and this project provides that for the personnel at this base.

STS security modifications—Johnson Space Center, Tex. and Vandenberg AFB, Calif.—The Committee recommends the full amount requested for these projects. The total of $14,700,000 will provide for the adequate security necessary for the success of the space transportation system.

U.S. Air Force Academy, Colo.—The Committee has restored two small projects deleted by the House. The land fee purchase at $380,000 will provide more adequate control of this parcel which runs through the Academy. The airmanship training facility at $900,000 is the continuation of a program begun last year.

Hill Air Force Base, Utah—Religious education center.—The Committee supports full funding of $1,600,000 for this facility. The new facility will allow for the centralization of several scattered programs which are operating in unsafe facilities.

Ramstein AB, Germany—Addition to accounting and finance center, passenger terminal, warehouse.—The House denied funds for each of these projects. The Committee recommends full funding for the facilities. The accounting and finance center at $1,450,000 will provide additional space necessary to meet the demands of this base. The Committee believes the cost estimate to be correct. The warehouse was denied by the House on the basis that it was NATO eligible. This $4,150,000 project will provide adequate storage to valuable equipment which supports U.S. mission requirements, not NATO. The passenger terminal at Ramstein will serve 100,000 passengers a year who arrive on C–5 and C–141 aircraft at this intra-theatre terminal. The Committee recommends $6,300,000 for the facility.

La Ceiba, Honduras—Contingency airfield improvements.—The House denied the funds for this project on the basis that funding provided in fiscal year 1983 allowed for sufficient access into this region. The $8,000,000 project will provide for a second airfield. The Committee is concerned, however, with increased tensions in Central America and intends to monitor all military construction in the region very carefully. The Committee directs that a detailed report be provided outlining all military construction programed, planned, or completed in the Central America region, and directs further that none of the funds appropriated for this project be obligated or expended until such report has been approved by the Committees on Appropriations. This would include such projects as contingency airfield facilities, training facilities, radar sites, and so forth. In addition, the report should outline the military and political impact of the military construction on the region.

Osan AB, Korea—Publications management center.—The Committee recommends $710,000 for this project denied by the House. The new facility will provide adequate space and conditions to store the numerous publications necessary at all military bases. The present site is substandard and leaks beyond control which ruins the costly documents.

Camp New Amsterdam, Netherlands—Base administration facility—The House denied funding for this project based on excessive cost. The Committee has again reviewed the Air Force estimate and believes it to be correct and, therefore, supports the project at $2,050,000.

Various locations, Turkey—Air base upgrade.—The Committee has approved the $66,700,000 requested for this project which was denied by the House based on a House authorization reduction. The Committee is fully aware that this program is eligible for NATO infrastructure funding; however, it is the Committee's belief that this project is of such importance that prefinancing is justified. The Committee urges the Department of the Air Force to seek recoupment of these funds at the earliest possible time. The strategic locations of the bases to be upgraded with these funds cannot be understated. While they are being developed as bases for the beddown of NATO/U.S. assigned tactical air rein-

forcement squadrons, the location must be considered for any contingency that may develp in the Middle East or Persian Gulf. The Turkish government has worked with the United States on this program and has agreed to prefinance their portion of the upgrade. The Committee strongly supports this project as critical to the overall strategy for the defense of Europe.

The Committee has learned of problems with contracts being written in Turkish for projects in that country. It is the Committee's understanding that delays in translation at times can slow construction by several months. The Committee believes that an effort should be made through Defense and/or State Department to alleviate any problems with the contracts in Turkey. The Department should report to the Committee on this situation.

RAF Mildenhall, United Kingdom—Visiting officer quarters.—The Committee recommends $3,100,000 for this project which was reduced by the House. Mildenhall is a headquarters base and thus receives many visitors and needs adequate space to house them.

Chemical warfare protection, various locations.—The House denied funds totaling $9,664,000 for projects to provide chemical warfare protection at locations in Korea, Germany, Italy, and Turkey. The Committee has restored these funds. Since the Air Force mission requires that they operate from existing airbases during a contingency, the functions vital to the flying mission must be protected for uninterrupted maintenance and operations. In addition, essential personnel must be protected. The Committee believes the request for these projects are of the highest priority.

Minor construction.—The Committee supports the budget request of $19,000,000 for this account. Adequate justification has been provided to the Committee to determine that the amount requested is necessary.

General reduction.—Due to budgetary constraints placed on the Committee, a general reduction of $98,000,000 has been recommended for the Air Force.

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tenn.—Accidents on November 18 and 27, 1982 destroyed the J–4 test cell at Arnold Engineering Development Center in Tullahoma, Tenn. This cell had been refurbished with military construction funds to accommodate testing of stage II of the MX missile. The Committee directs the Air Force to provide the Committees on Appropriations with a report outlining the plans for future use of the J–4 test cell and the altitude test program outlined for the MX stage II.

Military Construction, Defense Agencies

Fiscal year 1983 appropriation	$339,770,000
Fiscal year 1984 request	398,400,000
House allowance	259,042,000
Committee recommendation	311,750,000

The Committee has recommended appropriations totaling $311,750,000 for projects considered within the defense agencies account. The amount recommended reflects an increase of $52,708,000 to the House figure and a decrease of $86,650,000 to the budget request.

Specific program changes reflected in the Committee recommendation are discussed below: (See project listing at the end of the report for complete program recommendations.)

PROGRAM CHANGES

Authorization reductions.—The following projects were denied authorization by the Senate and thus are not included in the Committee recommendation:

Ohio: Defense Fuel Support Point Cincinnati—New fuel pier	$3,200,000
Pennsylvania: Defense Depot Mechanicsburg—Integrated material handling complex	18,000,000

OFFICE, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Minor construction.—The House reduced the request for exigent minor construction by $2,000,000. The Committee recommends the budget request of $4,000,000. The justification for this request indicates that $4,000,000 is necessary to allow for the unforeseen projects which are funded from this account.

Emergency construction.—The budget request for this account is $30,000,000. Reductions were made by the authorizing committees as well as the House in its appropriation bill. The House approved $10,000,000. The Committee recommends no funds for this account. While prior year unobligated balances in this account appear sufficient for fiscal year 1984, the Committee has also learned that duplicate authority exists for the account (10 U.S.C. 2804 and 10 U.S.C. 2803). Therefore, the Committee believes that funds can be provided from other sources if needed.

Planning and design.—The Committee recommends the budget request of $33,000,000 for planning and design of projects funded in the various defense agency accounts. The House reduced the account by $10,000,000. The Committee believes that in view of the increased missions for defense agencies planning and design, funds are needed to prepare military construction programs.

Defense System Management College, Fort Belvoir, Va., academic facility.—The House denied the $4,700,000 requested for this facility based on what appeared to be higher than normal costs. The Committee believes the project to be fully justified and recommends the full amount requested.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Anchorage, Alaska.—The Committee has restored the $1,000,000 reduced by the House from this project. While alternate building methods may be worthwhile to investigate, the Committee supports the project as justified.

DOD-DEPENDENT SCHOOLS

The House reduced the funding requested for many of the projects requested in this account. The reductions were based on House authorization figures. The Committee believes the projects are necessary and the budget amounts fully justified. The Committee has restored the House reductions as follows:

Germany, various locations (five schools)	$6,620,000
Philippines, various locations (four schools)	12,710,000
Turkey, Incirlik Air Base	1,370,000
United Kingdom, various locations (two schools)	408,000

While other school projects have been fully funded, the Committee has agreed with the House and denied funds for two schools as discussed earlier in the report under "Items of Special Interest." The projects deleted are as follows:

United Kingdom, Greenham Common	$12,770,000
Classified location	9,690,000

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Fort Meade, Md., special processing laboratory.—The House reduced the funding for this project by $3,000,000 on the basis that this amount of money was for a cafeteria in the building. The Committee has learned that only $1,000,000 will be used for the cafeteria. The remaining $2,000,000 in question is devoted to the construction of a mechanical equipment room and related equipment. The room will house equipment that provides a contamination-free environment essential for the extremely precise production of microelectronic chips. Therefore, the Committee recommends the full request for this project of $27,840,000.

Leased space.—The Committee is fully aware of NSA's plan to move out of leased space at the earliest possible time. The Committee is also aware of increased missions at this Agency which have forced the continued use of leased space. As stated in past years, the Committee supports the plan to move NSA operations out of leased space and into more secure facilities at Fort Meade. The Committee, however, understands budgetary constraints which force NSA to program only part of their needs in any one fiscal year. The Committee, as stated earlier, supports the program to move this important Agency into proper facilities at the earliest time.

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY

Defense Fuel Support Point, Long Beach, Calif., fuel pier.—The Committee recommends $42,100,000 for this project. The House denied the funds based on the current leasing arrangement. The Committee understands that the city of Long Beach is terminating the lease at this deteriorated pier. Based on additional operating costs of $5 to $8 million annually to sustain current support levels provided by this facility, the requested project will have a payback period of about 7 years. The Committee believes this project to be a good investment.

Defense Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pa.—Integrated material handling complex.—The Committee supports the DLA request to proceed with an $18,000,000 integrated material handling facility in Mechanicsburg, Pa. No funding has been included in the bill at this time since the authorization status for the project in fiscal year 1984 is unresolved. However, the Committee would be concerned by any delays in the progress of this project which might result and hopes that work will be able to begin at the earliest possible time.

NATO Infrastructure

Fiscal year 1983 appropriation	$325,000,000
Fiscal year 1984 request	150,000,000
House allowance	100,000,000
Committee recommendation	50,000,000

The Committee recommendation for the NATO infrastructure account is $50,000,000. This amount reflects a decrease from the House allowance of $50,000,000 and a decrease from the budget request of $100,000,000. Detail on the Committee's recommendation for this account is discussed earlier in the report under "Items of Special Interest."

Military Construction, Guard and Reserve Components

Fiscal year 1983 appropriation	$285,458,000
Fiscal year 1984 request	254,900,000
House allowance	299,174,000
Committee recommendation	261,910,000

The Committee recommends $261,910,000 for military construction projects for the Guard and Reserve components. This amount is $7,010,000 above the budget request and $37,264,000 below the House recommendation.

Individual component recommendations are as follows:

Component	Budget request	Committee recommendation
Army National Guard	$55,300,000	$59,300,000
Air National Guard	79,900,000	79,900,000
Army Reserve	52,700,000	54,700,000
Naval Reserve	24,800,000	26,810,000
Air Force Reserve	42,200,000	41,200,000

Specific program changes reflected in the Committee recommendation are discussed below: (See project listing at the end of the report for complete program recommendations.)

PROGRAM CHANGES

General reductions.—Due to budgetary constraints, general reductions have been taken from each of the Guard and Reserve Components. The general reductions should have no adverse impact on the components due to the continued favorable bidding climate. The reductions are as follows:

Army National Guard	$972,000
Air National Guard	732,000
Army Reserve	1,000,000
Naval Reserve	540,000
Air Force Reserve	1,000,000

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

Authorization reductions.—The following projects were added by the House but have not been authorized by the Senate and, therefore, are not recommended by the Committee:

Minnesota: St. Paul:	
Renovate armory	$647,000
Aviation flight facility	1,633,000
Mississippi: Camp Shelby:	
Land acquisition II	2,914,000
New York: Latham:	
600 person armory (partial reduction)	1,850,000
Maintenance shop	494,000
Buffalo: Maintenance shop	424,000

Authorization increases.—The following high-priority projects, which are not included in the House bill, have been authorized by the Senate as additions to the budget and the Committee recommends funding for the projects at the amounts noted:

Mississippi: Gloster	
Armory	$575,000
Indianola—Armory	572,000
Tennessee: Lebanon:	
Armory	900,000
Ohio: Camp Perry:	
Training facilities	380,000
West Virginia: Camp Dawson: Special forces training site building	695,000

ARMY RESERVE

Laurel, Miss., Reserve center.—The Senate has authorized $3,000,000 for this project which is needed to replace an old and outdated facility. The Committee recommends the full amount for appropriation.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD

Authorization reductions.—The following projects were added by the House but have not been authorized by the Senate and, therefore, are not recommended by the Committee:

Alabama: Dannelly Field—Base engineer facility	$520,000
New York: Stewart Airfield—Aircraft beddown	29,200,000

NAVAL RESERVE

Authorization reductions.—The following projects were added by the House but have not been authorized by the Senate and, therefore, are not recommended by the Committee:

Massachusetts: NAS South Weymouth—Main gate relocation	$1,400,000
Pennsylvania: NAS Willow Grove:	
Aircraft approach lights	250,000
Hangar fire protection	300,000
Texas: NAS Dallas:	
AICUZ III	295,000
Air traffic control	250,000
Chapel	1,500,000

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Center, Wheeling, W. Va.—The Committee recommends $2,900,000 for this facility. Because of ongoing discussions with officials of the Navy and West Virginia, the project was not included in the budget. However, authorization has been provided and design of the facility is well underway to allow construction to begin during fiscal year 1984.

Family Housing Overview

NEW CONSTRUCTION

The Committee has approved $185,454,000 for construction of new family housing. This Committee expressed concern last year over the cost of new family housing units and was pleased to see a reduction in the cost per unit in this budget. However, the Committee believes that the services and Defense agencies must continue to analyze military family housing costs. The Committee supported the test project at Fort Irwin, Calif., which will compare manufactured/factory built versus conventional-type housing. The Committee is also pleased to know that all new family housing can be competitively bid by contractors who deal with either manufactured/factory built or conventional-type housing. This practice has come about through the revision of the specifications for military family housing. Allowing competition from all segments of the housing construction industry can only help to foster better quality housing at the best possible price.

The House reduced the cost of many of the projects requested based upon the good bidding climate, a reduced cost per square foot, reductions in area cost factors, adjustments for economies of scale, and the repricing of supervision and overhead consistent among the services. The Committee has reviewed the House reductions and discussed with the services the House proposals. Where appropriate, the Committee has made reductions to individual projects where pricing adjustments have been noted since the budget submission. However, the House has provided the exact same cost as approved in the fiscal year 1983 appropriation. The Committee believes it is unrealistic to anticipate that, given the growing economic recovery, that costs will not increase between fiscal year 1983 and fiscal year 1984. The Committee believes that the fiscal year 1984 family housing new construction program is based on the best analysis of actual experience and projected increases required. Although economic conditions are such that favorable bids have been experienced, the Committee believes that economic forecasting predicting recovery provides the estimates at accurate levels.

CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS

The Committee recommends $179,329,000 for this account which will continue to address the growing number of older housing units in the inventory of the services. Improvements on these types of units are a cost-effective way to provide adequate housing without replacement costs.

The Committee continues to support the reprograming practices instituted in this account last year. However, the Committee is sympathetic to the fact that the list provided with the justifications may have additions and/or deletions throughout the fiscal year. If this Committee, or any other, specifically makes reference to a project, the services should follow the appropriate direction. But the Committee does not believe that each individual project should be subject to reprograming criteria. The Committee directs that a quarterly notification report be

supplied to the Committees on Appropriations showing changes within this account. This report should be similar to the justification documents and show projects completed, current working estimate of other projects, and additions or deletions to the account. The Committee knows of no abuse within this account as mentioned by the House; however, if the reports requested provide questionable material, the Committee will consider more stringent requirements next fiscal year.

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

The Committee has recommended $1,097,034,000 for operations and $1,111,216,000 for maintenance of family housing. The House made various reductions in the areas of foreign national pay increase, inflation, program management, and accommodation charges. The Committee has restored these reductions.

With regard to foreign national pay increases, these are budgeted based upon rates negotiated in master labor contracts between the State Department and individual foreign countries. Reductions to the account mean that there are inadequate funds for bills which must be paid. The Committee has continually supported the practice of budgeting for foreign national pay since they are known requirements.

The House reduced so-called accommodation charges within the account. In addition, the House has included a general provision—deleted by the Senate—directing that none of these charges be paid. Payment of accommodation charges are based upon long-standing international agreements with foreign governments. While the Committee is concerned over these charges, which are indeed questionable, unilateral cancellation does not appear to be the answer based on past experience. Therefore, the Committee directs the Department of Defense to enter into negotiations with the foreign governments involved to delete the payment of these charges.

In program management, the Committee is pleased that each of the services is better managing the accounts since they have had control of their funds. For example, the Committee has learned that the Army reduced this account by $7,000,000 prior to submission of the budget. Systematic reductions done in an orderly fashion provide better management control. The Committee supports such efforts.

The House made various reductions to the service accounts for inflation. The Committee has restored these reductions. The budget for family housing was reduced just prior to submission to reflect changes in inflation factors. The rate presently being used is almost exactly what inflation is running in the economy. In addition, budgeting for inflation is prescribed by Federal budget policy and the rates originate from the Office of Management and Budget and correspond to economic assumptions underlying the entire Federal budget. Because the operations account consists primarily of fixed costs, the House reductions will undoubtedly require reprograming action.

LEASING

The Committee has provided $175,509,000 for leasing of military family housing. With one exception (GLCM lease), this figure reflects the authorized level. The Committee supports the effort to reduce leasing costs whenever possible and to build new where cost analysis shows new construction to be less expensive.

The House reduced the account to encourage Defense and State to work with foreign governments and realize lower costs on what are considered high-cost leases. The Committee endorses the House position; however, since the leasing account provides for leases primarily in effect, the Committee has restored the funds.

HOUSING ASSURANCE PROGRAM

The administration requested new legislation within title 10 U.S.C. (military construction) to permit the military departments to enter into long-term rental agreements guaranteeing occupancy by military personnel.

The Committee supports the position taken by the Senate Armed Services Committee that the proposal has many unanswered questions. The Committee believes that such a program is a major policy change which could have an impact on the variable housing allowance (VHA) program which has, for the most part, been successful in meeting the needs of our military personnel.

The Committee is aware, however, that this matter will be in conference between the Armed Services Committees. If necessary, this matter can be addressed during conference on this bill.

REPROGRAMING CRITERIA

The Committee does not support the new reprograming criteria as proposed by the House.

The House established additional family housing reprograming criteria which subjects the transfer of an amount in excess of 25 percent, or $2,000,000, whichever is less, among or between the subaccounts of the family housing operations account of each service to prior Committee approval. The House also lowered the threshold on transfers among and between operations, maintenance, and leasing from $7,500,000 to $5,000,000.

In an operations and maintenance account it is important to have flexibility to address changing economic or program conditions. Budget estimates represent the best assessment of requirements which can be made at the time they are presented, but circumstances, priorities, and price levels all experience change during program execution. An operation and maintenance program is far more dynamic than a military construction project which has a well-defined scope. Therefore, controls which work acceptably for military construction projects present unreasonable barriers to operation and maintenance program execution. A $2,000,000 threshold on transfers among elements of expense equates to as little as 1-percent flexibility from budget estimates. Such precision is not possible to attain. Similar controls do not exist for regular service operation and maintenance accounts.

Implementation of these criteria would encounter practical obstacles. Service headquarters would have to prohibit any fund movements among expense elements by intermediate commands or field activities. Accounting systems to monitor and control obligations at this level of detail do not presently exist and would have to be created. The effort necessary to monitor and control obligations, and process requests to the Committees for each fund increase or decrease, would be extraordinary. No program management benefit would be derived.

A new reprograming rule was instituted in conference last year which subjects the transfer of an amount in excess of 10 percent, or $7,500,000, which is less, among or between operations, leasing, and maintenance to prior Committee approval. It has not yet been in effect a full year. While administratively burdensome, it has proven workable. Further restriction of the threshold to $5,000,000, which in some cases will amount to approximately 2-percent flexibility from budget estimates without prior congressional approval, will not lead to more efficient or effective program execution.

Family Housing, Army

Fiscal year 1983 appropriation	$1,078,874,000
Fiscal year 1984 request	1,272,639,000
House allowance	1,250,551,000
Committee recommendation	1,282,843,000

The Committee recommends $1,282,843,000 for family housing, Army in fiscal year 1984 which is $10,204,000 above the budget request and $32,292,000 above the House recommendation.

NEW CONSTRUCTION

The Committee has approved $68,412,000 for new construction of Army family housing as follows:

Alaska:	
Bethel	$386,000
Fort Greely	5,203,000
Kotzebue	386,000
Nome	386,000
Georgia: Fort Stewart	14,626,000
Hawaii: Aliamanu Military Reservation	7,300,000
Louisiana: Fort Polk	15,342,000
Germany:	
Bayreuth	1,132,000
Wildflecken	12,157,000
Wuerzburg/Kirzingen	11,140,000
Italy: Livorno—Camp Darby	354,000

Fort Stewart, Ga.—The Committee has approved the budget request of $14,626,000 for the construction of 244 family housing units at Fort Stewart. The Committee has taken this action only after careful examination and consideration of the request.

The Committee is aware of the opposition expressed by individuals in the business community surrounding Fort Stewart. The Committee is approving the request for these new units only after the release of a report requested by the local community and accomplished by the De-

partment of Housing and Urban Development concluded that the construction of the units is justified.

However, in an effort to insure that the new construction will not have a negative impact on those housing units now under construction by private developers in the Fort Stewart area, the Committee directs that none of the funds appropriated for these units at Fort Stewart may be obligated until January 1, 1984. In addition, the Army is to report to the Committees on Appropriations not later than December 1, 1983, on the housing occupancy of units now under construction on and off Fort Stewart. Upon receipt of this report, the Committee will provide in writing the authorization to proceed with the construction if there has been no change in the expected occupancy rates.

In a further effort to work with the local community, the Committee has discussed with the Army future construction of units at Fort Stewart. The Committee is pleased to learn that the Army has deferred any request for new units in fiscal year 1985. As indicated in the HUD report, the need for adequate housing in the Fort Stewart area is dramatic and continues to grow. The private sector should seize upon the HUD report as the justification to construct the types of units needed in the area.

During the review of the fiscal year 1985 budget, the Committee will hold hearings on family housing and the methodology used to determine housing shortages at military installations.

Aliamanu Military Reservation, Hawaii, consolidated community center.—The Committee has reduced the request for this project to $7,300,000. The Committee has taken this action based on the fact that the $2,600,000 cut is available from the amount approved last year for the project. Funding for phase I of this facility was done from available savings as directed by the authorization committee. The Committee understands that the Army has not appealed the House direction on this project regarding covered walkways and other site preparations, and, therefore, the Committee supports the House position on that part of the construction.

Various locations, Europe/NATO—500 units.—The Committee has agreed with the Senate Armed Services Committee on the need for additional housing throughout Europe. The Committee supports the $40,000,000 authorized to be funded from available savings (either from Army military construction or Army family housing) for these units. The Committee directs the Army to comply with the language included in S. Rept. 98–174 concerning the use of manufactured/factory built housing and further directs that the reporting requirements to the appropriate committees of Congress be adhered to.

CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS

The Committee has recommended the authorized level of $102,893,000 for this account.

PLANNING AND DESIGN

The Committee has approved the budget request for $6,750,000 for this account. While the increase is substantial over last year's appropriation, the committee is aware of the Army's effort to improve family housing. Planning and design funds are essential to insure that cost estimates for these improvements and construction are correct.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

The Committee recommends $996,092,000 for these accounts. For operations, the Committee has approved the budget request fop the subaccounts with the exception of furnishings which shows an increase of $37,900,000. This amgunt is the authorized level and is offset in the military pepsonnel accounts of the Defense bill as changes to regulations concening shipment of personal household items.

LEASING

The Committee approved $86,258,000 which is the authorized level.

GENERAL REDUCTION

Due to budgetary constraints, the Committee has taken a general reduction of $12,400,000 from the Army family housing account.

FAMILY HOUSING, NAVY

Fiscal year 1983 appropriation	$769,098,000
Fiscal year 1984 request	703,877,000
House allowance	616,374,000
Committee recommendation	654,527,000

The Committee recommends $654,527,000 for family housing, Navy in fiscal year 1984 which is $49,350,000 below the budget request and $38,153,000 above the House allowance.

NEW CONSTRUCTION

The Committee recommends $59,874,000 for this account. Two projects in Italy totaling $34,000,000 have not been fulded since they failed authorization. The new projects are as follows:

California:	
MCAS El Toro	$11,076,000
MCB Camp Pendleton	21,502,000
Philippines: PWC Subic Bay	13,240,000

CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS

The Committee has provided the budget request of $13,240,000. The House reduced the request to offset projects funded through H.R. 1718, the "Jobs Bill." The Committee supports the full request only because of the need to improve existing units. The Committee directs the Navy to provide a revised list of projects to be accomplished for this account within 5 working days after this bill is reported to the Senate. This list should also be provided to the House prior to conference to allow for a compromise position if necessary.

PLANNING AND DESIGN

The Committee supports the budget request of $7,395,000 for this account.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

The Committee supports the budget and authorized level of $535,260,000 for these accounts.

LEASING

The commitee recommends $18,212,000 for Navy family housing leases. This amount is the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

GENERAL REDUCTION

Due to budgetary constraints, the Committee has taken a general reduciton of $10,703,000 from the navy family housing account.

FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE

Fiscal year 1983 appropriation	$970,361,000
Fiscal year 1984 request	947,176,000
House allowance	849,605,000
Committee recommendation	893,734,000

The Committee recommends $893,734,000 for family housing, Air Force in fiscal year 1984 which is $53,442,000 below the budget request and $44,129,000 above the House recommendation.

NEW CONSTRUCTION

The Committee has approved $55,958,000 for construction of new units as follows:

Montana:	
Forsyth AFS	$4,000,000
Havre AFS	496,000
Netherlands: Camp New Amsterdam	5,218,000
Portugal: Lajes AB	12,262,000
United Kingdom: RAF Upper Heyford	33,982,000

The Committee has denied the funds requested for Warren AFB, Wyo. ($20,000,000) because of lack of authorization. Funds for new construction at RAF Greenham Common, United Kingdom ($24,246,000) have not been recommended as they are part of the GLCM support facilities which are discussed earlier in the report.

CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS

The Committee has approved $63,161,000 which is the Senate authorized level for this account.

PLANNING AND DESA'N

The Committee recommends $5,000,000 for this account. As stated earlier, the Committee considers planning and design funds vitally important to accurate cost estimates.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

The Committee recommendation for these accounts is $658,399,000. The amount allowed reflects the authorized level.

LEASING

The Committee has approved $55,808,000 for leasing of family housing units for the Air Force. The reduction reflects a lease for family housing in support of GLCM0activities.

GENERAL REDUCTION

Because of the Committee's decision on reluctions to accounts within the Air Force family housing request, no general reduction is necessary to meet budgetary guidelines.

FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE AGENCIES

Fiscal year 1983 appropriation	$14,313,000
Fiscal year 1984 request	19,744,000
House allowance	16,674,000
Committee recommendation	19,744,000

The Committee recommends $19,744,000 for family housing, Defense Agencies in fiscal year 1984 which is the same as the budget request and $3,070,000 above the House recommendation.

Detail on the Committee recommendation for this account an be found in the detail tables at the end of the report.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Committee has made no changes to sections 101 through 108 of the general provisions included in the House bill. Other changes are as follows:

Section 109.—As requested in the President's budget, this provision has been deleted. The provision deals with the relocation of activities from one base to another using minor construction funds. The Committee believes this provision ic not applicable to this bill.

Section 110.—This provision deals with base realinements or closures. The administration again requested that this provision be deleted, and the Committee supports the request. Base realinements or closures are covered by other appropriate legislation specifically addressing this issue.

Section 111.—Renumbered as section 109.

Section 112.—Renulbered as section 110.

Section 113.—Renumbered as section 111.

Section 114.—The Committee has deleted this provision as has been done in the past. The payment of real property taxes in a foreign nation on military family housing is an obligation which in many instances is part of the status of forces agreement with such nation.

Section 115.—Renumbered as section 112.

Section 116.—Renumbered as section 113.

Section 117.—Renumbered as section 114.

Section 118.—Renumbered as section 115.

Section 119.—Renumbered as section 116 and modified. This provision included by the House concerns the establishment on new installations overseas without congressional review. The Committee has modified the provision because of a ruling by counsel that it is tnconstitutional and subject to a legislative veto. The modified provision is as follows:

> SEC. 116. None of the funds in this Act may be used to initiate a new installation overseas without prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations.

Section 120.—The Committee has deleted this provision included by the House. The provision deals with the beddown of F–16 aircraft at Misawa Air Base, Japan. The Committee has included no funds for the proposed beddown and, therefore, the provision is not applicable. The Committee notes, however, that the provision as written is subject to a legislative veto.

Other changes.—The Committee agrees with the House on the deletion of transfer authority contained in the defense agdncies account. This authority concerns R&D construction but has not been used since

1970. The Department of Defense testified before Congress that there is no present or future need for the provision.

The President's budget requested a new general provision (section 113) which provides for a general transfer authority between current and prior fiscal years for all of the accounts in this bill. The Committ,e does not support such a provision and has not included it in this act.

New provisions.—The Committee has included three new general provisions. The appropriata section number, text of the provision and an explanation of these items is as follows:

Section 117.—The Committee has included this general provision as requested in the President's budget. The provision makes military construction funds available until expended. This is the way funds were provided until the fiscal year 1979 act when the0accounts were changed to a 5-year period of availability. At that time, the Senate indicated that while it perceived no significant advantage to the change, it would acquiesce in the change suggested by the House. After 4 ycars' experience with this provision, the Committee concludes that there has been no significant change in the execution of the programs approved during this time. The Committee has learned, however, of a significant additional burden imposed upon the Department of Defense because of the accounting and records management requirements which flow from the 5-year availability of appropriations. The Committee believes that adequate oversight of military construction appropriations is provided in existing law. Therefore, the following general provision has been included.

> SEC. 117. Appropriations heretofore made available for Military Construction, Army; Military Construction, Navy; Military Construction, Air Force; Military Construction, Defense Agencies; Military Construction, Army National Guard; Military Construction, Air National Guard; Military Construction, Army Reserve; Military Construction, Naval Reserve; Military Construction, Air Force Reserve; and for construction for Family Housing, Defense, Family Housing, Army, Family Housing, Navy and Marine Corps, and Familydhousing, Air Force, shall remain available until expended. Each such appropriation shall be merged with the appropriations made in this Act under the same head. (Military Construction Appropmation Act, 1983.)

Section 118.—The Committee has included a general provision which was previously in the act for fiscal year 1982. It is a sense of the Congress provision dealing with burden sharing. The provision is as follows:

> SEC. 118. It is the sense of the Congress that the Administration should call on the pertinent member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and on Japan to meet or exceed their pledges for at least a 3 per centum real increase in defense spending and furtherance of increased unity, equitable sharing of our common defense burden, and international stability.

Section 119.—The Committee has included a new provision which provides that funds appropriated in this act may not be made available to any nation that the President certifies to Congress is not taking adequate steps to cooperate with the United States in stemming the flow of narcotic drugs and other controlled substances into thas country. The text of the provision is as follows:

> SEC. 119. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be available for any country when the President determines that the ggvernment of such country has failed to take adequate measures to prevent narcotic drugs or other controlled substances cultivated or produced or processed illicitly, in whole or in part, in such country, or transported through such country, from being sold illegally within the jurisd)ction of such country to United States Government personnel or their dependents, or from being smuggled into the United States. Such prohibition shall continue in force until the President determines and reports to the Congress in writing that—
>
> "(1) the government of such country has prepared, presented, and committed itself to a plan providing for the control, reduction, and gradual elimination of the illicit cultivation, production, processing, transportation, and distribution of narcotic drugs and other controlled substances within an explicitly stated period of time, with implementation commencing prior to the renewal of assistance to such country; and
>
> "(2) the government of such country has takdn legal and law enforcement measures to enforce effective suppression of the illicit cultivation, production, processing, transportation, and distribution of narcotic drugs and other controlled substances.".

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	DOD request	House allowance	SASC authorization compared to budget	Committee recommendation
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
ALABAMA				
ARMY				
FORT MCCLELLAN				
BOILER PLANT SHUTDOWN	280	280	---	280
INFANTRY REMOTE TARGET SYSTEM RANGES	3,500	3,500	---	3,500
MACHINE-GUN TRAINING RANGE	440	440	---	440
REDSTONE ARSENAL				
LABORATORY ADDITION	2,600	2,600	---	2,600
MISSILE SYSTEM SOFTWARE CENTER	16,000	16,000	---	16,000
WEAPONS MAINTENANCE TRAINING FACILITY	5,700	5,700	---	5,700
WEAPONS MAINTENANCE TRAINING FACILITY	1,100	1,100	---	1,100
FORT RUCKER				
CLASSROOMS WITH STAGING FIELD	6,600	6,600	---	6,600
ADDITIONAL CLASSROOM	---	---	---	---
FLIGHT SIMULATOR BUILDING	3,050	3,050	---	3,050
AIR FORCE				
GUNTER AFB				
ADD TO/ALTER SENIOR NCO ACADEMY	1,750	1,750	---	1,750
TWO UEPH	---	5,000	(+5,000)	(5,000)
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD				
BIRMINGHAM				
ARMED FORCES RESERVE CENTER	979	979	---	979
CULLMAN				
ARMED FORCES RESERVE CENTER	458	458	---	458
COMBINED SUPPORT MAINTENANCE SHOP	1,601	1,601	---	1,601
AIR NATIONAL GUARD				
CENTERVILLE				
IMPROVEMENTS	---	732	+732	732
DANNELLY FIELD				
WEAPONS CALIBRATION SHELTER	470	470	---	470
BASE ENGINEER FAC	---	520	---	---
ARMY RESERVE				
BIRMINGHAM				
ARMED FORCES RESERVE CTR-MAINTENANCE SHOP	4,441	4,441	---	4,441
CULLMAN				
ARMED FORCES RESERVE CTR-MAINTENANCE SHOP	541	541	---	541
AIR FORCE RESERVE				
MAXWELL AFB				
ADD/ALT HANGAR	1,498	1,498	---	1,498
FUEL SYS MAINT DOCK	2,457	2,457	---	2,457
TOTAL, ALABAMA	53,465	59,717	+732	54,197
ALASKA				
ARMY				
FORT RICHARDSON				
RANGE AND TRAINING FACILITY IMPROVEMENTS	940	940	---	940
NAVY				
NAVAL SECURITY GROUP ACTIVITY ADAK				
ELECTRONICS STORAGE	2,000	---	-2,000	---
PUBLIC WORKS MAINTENANCE STORAGE	1,490	---	-1,490	---
NAVAL STAION ADAK				
SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS	2,970	2,970	---	2,970

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project (1)	DOD request (2)	House allowance (3)	SASC authorization compared to budget (4)	Committee recommendation (5)
AIR FORCE				
EIELSON AFB				
EXTEND UTILITIES	14,000	20,000	+6,000	20,000
MAINTENANCE HANGARS	16,170	16,170	---	16,170
MEDICAL/DENTAL CLINIC	22,220	18,000	---	22,220
ELMENDORF AFB				
ADD TO SATELLITE COMM GROUND TERMINAL	1,300	---	---	1,300
AIR FREIGHT TERMINAL	10,200	10,200	---	10,200
HOSPITAL HEAT RECOVERY	570	570	---	570
GALENA AIRPORT				
CONTROL TOWER	3,950	3,950	---	3,950
COMPOSITE OPERATIONS	---	---	(+3,700)	(3,700)
COMPOSITE SPT FACILITY	---	---	(+5,700)	(5,700)
SHEMYA AFB				
AIRCRAFT HANGAR	24,200	---	---	24,200
TRANSIENT QTRS	11,000	11,000	---	11,000
UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED PERSONNEL HOUSING	10,400	10,400	---	10,400
DEFENSE AGENCIES				
DEFENSE FUEL SUPPORT POINT ADAK				
FUEL TANKAGE	14,200	14,200	---	14,200
DEFENSE PROPERTY DISPOSAL OFFICE ANCHORAGE				
COVERED STORAGE	2,500	1,500	---	2,500
TOTAL: ALASKA	138,110	109,990	+2,510	140,620
ARIZONA				
ARMY				
FORT HUACHUCA				
BRIGADE HEADQUARTERS	---	---	(+1,500)	(1,500)
TRAINING FACILITY	650	650	---	650
WAREHOUSE	600	600	---	600
NAVY				
MARINE CORPS AIR STATION YUMA				
ORDNANCE HANDLING PAD	8,920	8,920	---	8,920
AIR FORCE				
DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB				
AIRCRAFT GENERATION SQDN PARTS STORAGE	570	570	---	570
ALTER UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED PERSONNEL HSG	4,800	4,800	---	4,800
ENVIRONMENTAL MEDICAL FAC	480	480	---	480
LUKE AFB				
DATA PROCESSING FACILITY	1,400	1,400	---	1,400
FIRE STATION	2,250	2,250	---	2,250
FLIGHT SIMULATOR TRAINING FACILITY	2,100	2,100	---	2,100
RADIO CONTROL SYSTEM	240	213	---	213
SOUND SUPPRESSOR SUPPORT	700	700	---	700
VEHICLE MAINTENANCE	3,000	3,000	---	3,000
WILLIAMS AFB				
FIELD TRAINING FAC	950	950	---	950
FLIGHT FACILITIES MAINTENANCE SHOP	500	---	-500	---
RECREATION COMPLEX	1,750	900	---	1,750
ADDITION TO DMS	---	---	(+2,000)	(2,000)

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project (1)	DOD request (2)	House allowance (3)	SASC authorization compared to budget (4)	Committee recommendation (5)
AIR FORCE RESERVE				
LUKE AFB				
AEROSPACE GROUND EQUIPMENT SHOP STORAGE	620	620	---	620
CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS SHOP	950	950	---	950
HANGAR/SHOPS	3,200	3,200	---	3,200
MUNITIONS STORAGE	300	300	---	300
TOTAL, ARIZONA	33,980	32,603	-500	33,453
ARKANSAS				
ARMY				
PINE BLUFF ARSENAL				
CHEMICAL AGENT DISPOSAL FACILITY	10,200	10,200	-10,200	---
AIR FORCE				
BLYTHEVILLE AFB				
AIR LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE IGLOOS	1,800	1,800	---	1,800
ENVIR MONITORING & CONTROL SYS (EMCS)	2,120	2,120	-2,120	---
TANKER ALERT AREA	3,550	3,550	---	3,550
TANKER ALERT CREW FAC	1,600	1,600	---	1,600
LITTLE ROCK AFB				
REFUELING VEHICLE PARKING	620	620	---	620
REGIONAL SEWAGE CONNECTION	2,500	2,500	---	2,500
VISITING OFFICER QTRS	2,850	2,850	-2,850	---
TOTAL, ARKANSAS	25,240	25,240	-15,170	10,070
CALIFORNIA				
ARMY				
FORT HUNTER LIGGETT				
PHYSICAL FITNESS TRAINING CENTER	2,850	1,000	-2,850	---
FT IRWIN				
AMMUNITION STORAGE	10,800	10,800	---	10,800
BARRACKS MODERNIZATION	7,700	7,700	-7,700	---
COMMUNICATION AND COMPUTER CENTER	1,900	1,900	---	1,900
FIRE STATION	850	850	---	850
MODERNIZE MISCELLANEOUS FACILITIES	2,100	1,350	-2,100	---
OUTDOOR COURTS AND FIELDS	2,400	1,000	---	2,400
PHYSICAL FITNESS TRAINING CENTER	5,800	---	---	5,800
UNACCOMPANIED OFFICER HOUSING	5,400	5,400	---	5,400
FORT ORD				
BATTALION HEADQUARTERS AND CLASSROOM	1,200	1,200	---	1,200
COMPANY ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPLY	1,750	1,750	---	1,750
WATER WELLS	3,200	---	---	3,200
PRESIDIO OF MONTEREY				
DINING FACILITY MODERNIZATION	1,300	1,300	---	1,300
SIERRA ARMY DEPOT				
COMMUNICATIONS CENTER ADDITION	1,750	1,750	---	1,750
PHYSICAL FITNESS TRAINING CENTER	2,200	1,000	---	2,200
NAVY				
FLEET ANTI-SUB WARF TRNG CTR PAC SAN DIEGO				
OPERATIONAL TRAINER FAC	14,200	14,200	---	14,200
FLEET NUMERICAL OCEANOGRAPHY CTR MONTEREY				
METEOROLOGICAL BUILDING	6,980	6,980	---	6,980

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	DOD request	House allowance	SASC authorization compared to budget	Committee recommendation
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
FLEET TRAINING CENTER, SAN DIEGO				
APPLIED INSTRUCTION BLDG	---	---	+10,000	10,000
MARCORP AIR-GRND COMB CTR TWENTYNINE PALMS				
COLD STORAGE WAREHOUSE	1,390	1,390	---	1,390
ENLISTED DINING FACILITY MODERNIZATION	2,070	2,070	---	2,070
MAINTENANCE FACILITIES	6,220	6,220	---	6,220
MAINTENANCE FACILITY	6,610	6,610	---	6,610
UNACCOMP ENLISTED PERS HOUSING	8,830	8,830	---	8,830
MARINE CORPS AIR STATION EL TORO				
MAINTENANCE FACILITY	5,230	5,230	---	5,230
MAINTENANCE HANGAR ADDITON	8,800	8,800	---	8,800
MARINE CORPS AIR STATION TUSTIN				
OIL SPILL PREVENTION	465	465	---	465
MARINE CORPS BASE CAMP PENDLETON				
AIRFIELD PAVEMENT IMP (MCAF)	6,230	6,230	---	6,230
AMPHIBIOUS VEHICLE TEST CENTER	3,160	3,160	---	3,160
DATA PEOCESSING CENTER	6,420	6,420	---	6,420
ENLISTED DINING FACILITY MODERNIZATION	2,020	2,020	---	2,020
ENLISTED DINING FACILITY MWTC BRIDGEPORT	5,580	5,580	---	5,580
MAINTENANCE FAC FIRE STATION BRIDGEPORT	2,090	2,090	---	2,090
UNACCOMP ENLISTED PERS HOUSING	13,570	13,570	---	13,570
MARINE CORPS RECRUIT DEPOT SAN DIEGO				
RECRUIT PROCESS BUILDING	10,690	10,690	---	10,690
NAVAL AIR REWORK FACILITY ALAMEDA				
CORROSION CONTROL FACILITY	18,600	18,600	---	18,600
ENGINE TEST CELL MODIFICATIONS	4,740	---	-4,740	---
MATERIALS ENGINEERING LABORATORY	2,960	2,960	---	2,960
NAVAL AIR STATION LEMOORE				
AIRFIELD PAVE IMPOVS	4,500	4,500	---	4,500
APPLIED INSTRUCTION BUILDING	5,390	5,390	---	5,390
INERT STOREHOUSE	900	900	---	900
ORDNANCE OPERATIONS BLDG	1,400	1,400	---	1,400
SEWERAGE SYSTEM	1,950	1,950	---	1,950
TELEPHONE EXCHANGE BUILDING	740	740	---	740
UNACCOMP ENLISTED PERS HOUSING	6,040	6,040	---	6,040
NSA MARE ISLAND				
UEPH MODERNIZATION	---	1,800	---	---
NSY MARE ISLAND				
PAINT & BLAST FAC	---	6,000	---	---
ELEC DISTR LINES	---	---	---	---
FAC ENERGY IMPR	---	1,600	---	---
NAVAL AIR STATION MIRAMAR				
ENGINE MAINTENANCE SHOP ADDITION	2,020	2,020	---	2,020
NAVAL AIR STATION NORTH ISLAND				
AIRCRAFT PARKING APRON	9,490	9,490	---	9,490
INSTRUMENT CALIBRATION SHOP	1,390	1,390	---	1,390
UNACCOMP OFFICER PERS HOUSING	9,770	9,770	---	9,770
NAVAL AIR STSTION MOFFETT FIELD				
AIRCRAFT DIRECT FUELING STATION	480	480	---	480
OPERATIONAL TRAINER FACILITY	1,390	1,390	---	1,390
NAVAL AMPHIBIOUS BASE CORONADO				
LANDING CRAFT AIR CUSHION COMPLEX(CP PEND)	21,222	15,000	---	21,222
NAVAL OCEAN SYSTEMS CENTER SAN DIEGO				
OCEAN SCIENCES LAB	8,000	8,000	---	8,000

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project (1)	DOD request (2)	House allowance (3)	SASC authorization compared to budget (4)	Committee recommendation (5)
NAVAL REGIONAL MEDICAL CENTER LONG BEACH				
MEDICAL CLINIC (NCBC PORT HUENEME)	8,370	8,370	---	8,370
NAVAL STATION MARE ISLAND VALLEJO				
FAMILY SERVICES CENTER	210	210	---	210
NAVAL STATION SAN DIEGO				
FIRE STATION	980	980	---	980
NAVAL SUBMARINE BASE SAN DIEGO				
ENLISTED DINING FAC ADDN	1,120	1,120	---	1,120
HIGH EXPLOSIVE MAGAZINES	1,390	1,390	---	1,390
UNACCOMP OFFICER PERS HOUSING	4,150	3,000	---	3,700
NAVAL SUPPLY CENTER SAN DIEGO				
LIQUID FUELING AND DISPENSING FACILITY	1,110	1,110	---	1,110
NAVAL WEAPONS CENTER CHINA LAKE				
RADIOGRAPHIC INSPECTION FACILITY	12,240	10,000	---	12,240
RANGE OPERATION & INSTRUMENTATION LAB	6,810	6,810	---	6,810
TRIDENT II MOTOR TEST FACILITY	12,050	12,050	---	12,050
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION CONCORD				
ENLISTED DINING FACILITY	1,310	1,310	---	1,310
LAND ACQUISITION	830	830	---	830
MISSILE COMPONENT REWORK BUILDING	580	580	---	580
PACIFIC MISSILE TEST CENTER POINT MUGU				
MISSILE TEST CELL	840	840	---	840
PUBLIC WORKS CENTER SAN FRANCISCO				
VENTILATION IMPROVES	220	220	---	220
TACTICAL TRAINING GROUP PACIFIC SAN DIEGO				
OPERATIONAL TRAINER FAC	3,260	---	---	3,260
AIR FORCE				
BEALE AFB				
ADD TO/ALTER CHILD CARE CENTER	760	760	---	760
PAVE PAWS POWER LINE UPGRADE	990	990	---	990
UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED PERSONNEL HOUSING	3,800	3,800	---	3,800
CASTLE AFB				
UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED PERSONNEL HOUSING	6,500	6,500	---	6,500
EDWARDS AFB				
ADD TO/ALTER GYMNASIUM	390	390	---	390
ALTER SATELLITE PROPULSION RESEARCH FAC	5,400	5,400	---	5,400
ALTER UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED PERSONNEL HSG	2,000	2,000	---	2,000
CONTROL TOWER	2,500	2,500	---	2,500
HIGH EFFICIENCY LIGHTS	220	220	---	220
SOUND SUPPRESSOR SUPPORT	1,100	1,100	---	1,100
TEST ENGINE SUPPORT FACILITY	5,700	5,700	---	5,700
RAPCON/CCF FACILITY	---	---	(+490)	(490)
GEORGE AFB				
ALTER MECHANICAL/ELECTRICAL	220	220	---	220
LONG BEACH NAVAL BASE				
ADMINISTRATIVE FAC	500	---	-500	---
LOS ANGELES AFS				
ADD TO/ALTER GYMNASIUM	1,700	---	---	1,700
CHILD CARE CENTER	970	970	---	970
MARCH AFB				
DENTAL CLINIC	3,550	3,550	---	3,550

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project (1)	DOD request (2)	House allowance (3)	SASC authorization compared to budget (4)	Committee recommendation (5)
MATHER AFB				
ADD TO/ALTER OFFENSIVE AVIONICS FACILITY	1,450	1,450	---	1,450
CONTROL TOWER	2,200	2,200	---	2,200
OSH-FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEMS	810	810	---	810
MCCLELLAN AFB				
SOUND SUPPRESSOR SUPPORT	800	800	---	800
DEPOT FACILITY	---	3,500	(+3,500)	(3,500)
INSPECTION FACILITY	---	5,900	(+5,900)	(5,900)
NORTON AFB				
ACCESS ROAD & BRIDGE	---	6,400	(+6,400)	(6,400)
TRAVIS AFB				
ALTER REFUELING VEHICLE SHOP	600	600	---	600
BOILER/HIGH EFFICIENCY LIGHTING	600	600	---	600
MEDICAL FACILITY	---	52,000	---	---
VANDENBERG AFB				
ADD TO GYMNASIUM	380	---	-380	---
ADDITION TO FIRE STATION	720	720	---	720
STS-EXTERNAL TANK AREA ICING PROTECTION	6,600	---	---	6,600
STS-HAZARDOUS MATERIAL MGMT FACS	21,900	21,900	---	21,900
STS-SECURITY MODIFICATIONS	14,000	10,000	---	14,000
UNINTERRUPTIPLE POWER SUPPLY-RANGE OPNS	2,782	2,782	---	2,782
DEFENSE AGENCIES				
DEF FUEL SUPPORT POINT OZOL				
FIRE PROTECTION	1,100	1,100	---	1,100
DEF FUEL SUPPORT POINT NAV STA LONG BEACH				
FUEL PIER	42,100	---	---	42,100
DEF PROPERTY DISPOSAL OFFICE VANDENBERG				
HAZARDOUS MATERIAL DISPOSAL FACILITY	880	880	---	880
DEFENSE DEPOT TRACY				
STOCK MECHANIZATION FACILITY	480	480	---	480
PRESIDIO OF MONTEREY				
BASE-WIDE UTILITIES UPGRADE	5,600	5,600	---	5,600
ENLISTED BARRACKS	14,300	14,300	---	14,300
GENERAL INSTRUCTION FACILITY	9,200	9,200	---	9,200
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD				
FRESNO				
200 PERSON ARMORY	1,066	1,066	---	1,066
AVIATION CLASSIFICATION REPAIR DEPOT	5,530	5,530	---	5,530
AIR NATIONAL GUARD				
MARCH AFB				
COMPOSITE BASE SUPPORT FAC	2,200	2,200	---	2,200
MOFFETT NAS				
UPGRADE FIRE PROTECTION WATER SUPPLY	300	300	---	300
NAVY RESERVE				
NAVAL AIR RESERVE UNIT ALAMEDA				
INSTALL 400HZ POWER IN MAINT HANGER	500	500	---	500
AIR FORCE RESERVE				
MARCH AFB				
ADD TO SQDN OPNS	682	682	---	682
NORTON AFB				
CIVIL ENGINEERING TRAINING FAC	650	650	---	650
RESERVE FORCES AEROMED EVAC TRAINING FAC	1,465	1,465	---	1,465

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project (1)	DOD request (2)	House allowance (3)	SASC authorization compared to budget (4)	Committee recommendation (5)
TRAVIS AFB				
ADD/ALT RES FORCES AEROMED EVAC TRNG FAC	1,045	1,045	---	1,045
TOTAL, CALIFORNIA	494,447	484,555	-8,270	485,727
COLORADO				
ARMY				
FORT CARSON				
CORRECT SAFETY DEFICIENCIES	270	270	---	270
FENCING	890	---	---	890
OPERATIONS BUILDING	---	---	(+2,000)	(2,000)
RANGE ROADS	7,200	7,200	---	7,200
SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT EXPANSION	490	490	---	490
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	7,800	7,800	---	7,800
AIR FORCE				
BUCKLEY AIR NATIONAL GUARD BASE				
COMMERCIAL POWER CONNECTION	2,000	---	---	2,000
NORAD CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX				
CONVERT TO COMPUTER FAC	1,700	1,700	---	1,700
COOLING TOWERS	710	710	---	710
TECHNICAL SUPPORT FAC	3,250	3,250	---	3,250
PETERSON AFB				
CONSOL SPACE OPS CTR(CSOC)ACCESS ROADS	1,250	1,250	---	1,250
CONSOLIDATED SPACE OPNS CTR(CSOC)PHASE II	73,750	73,750	---	73,750
TEST/DEVELOPMENT AND TNG CTR	4,950	4,950	---	4,950
US AIR FORCE ACADEMY				
ADD TO COMMUNITY CENTER CHAPEL ANNEX	490	490	---	490
ADD TO/ALTER FIRE STATIONS	440	440	---	440
AIRMANSHIP TRNG SUPPORT FAC	900	---	---	900
ALTER CADET PERSONNEL HOUSING	2,000	2,000	---	2,000
INSULATE/ALTER MECHANICAL	4,975	4,975	---	4,975
LAND FEE PURCHASE	380	---	---	380
SEWAGE FLOW EQUAL BASIN	550	550	---	550
UPGRADE HEAT/HOT WATER MAINS	350	350	---	350
DEFENSE AGENCIES				
DEF PROPERTY DISPOSAL OFF COLORADO SPRINGS				
RELOCATE SCRAP YARD	810	810	---	810
TOTAL, COLORADO	115,155	110,985	---	115,155
CONNECTICUT				
NAVY				
NAVAL SUBMARINE BASE NEW LONDON				
GENERAL PURPOSE/BERTH PIER	8,200	8,200	---	8,200
QUAYWALLS	3,770	3,770	-3,770	---
UNACCOMP ENLISTED PERS HOUSING IMPRS	870	---	-870	---
NAVAL SUBMARINE MEDICAL CENTER NEW LONDON				
HOSPITAL EXPANSION	6,510	6,510	-6,510	---
NAVAL SUBMARINE SCHOOL NEW LONDON				
APPLIED INSTRUCTION BLDG	7,340	7,340	-7,340	---
OPERATIONAL TRAINER FAC	4,840	4,840	-4,840	---
TOTAL, CONNECTICUT	31,530	30,660	-23,330	8,200

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	DOD request	House allowance	SASC authorization compared to budget	Committee recommendation
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
DELAWARE				
AIR FORCE				
DOVER AFB				
BASE COLD STORAGE	600	600	---	600
UPGRADE COMPOSITE MEDICAL FAC	700	700	---	700
AIR NATIONAL GUARD				
GREATER WILMINGTON AIRPORT				
SECURITY POLICE OPNS FAC	350	350	---	350
TOTAL, DELAWARE	1,650	1,650	---	1,650
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA				
ARMY				
WALTER REED ARMY MED CTR				
INSULATE BUILDINGS	250	250	---	250
STEAM DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	3,950	3,950	---	3,950
AIR FORCE				
BOLLING AFB				
GYMNASIUM	3,650	---	-3,650	---
POST OFFICE	620	620	-620	---
TOTAL, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	8,470	4,820	-4,270	4,200
FLORIDA				
NAVY				
NARF JACKSONVILLE				
LANDING GEAR SHOP	275	275	---	275
MATERIALS ENGINEERING LAB	2,600	2,600	---	2,600
NAS CECIL FIELD				
ENG TEST CELL MODS	1,180	1,180	---	1,180
FAMILY SERVICES CENTER	510	510	---	510
GENERAL WAREHOUSE ADDN	2,700	2,700	---	2,700
MAINTENANCE HANGAR	7,500	---	---	7,500
OPERATIONAL TRAINER FAC	4,000	4,000	---	4,000
SWGE & IND WST TRMT PLT IMPS	1,780	1,780	---	1,780
NAS JACKSONVILLE				
UEPH	---	---	---	---
NAS KEY WEST				
AIR COMBAT MANUEVERING RANGE	---	---	+11,800	11,800
BERTHING WHARF IMPROVES	5,530	5,530	---	5,530
FAMILY SERVICES CENTER	495	495	---	495
LAND ACQUISITION	6,810	6,810	---	6,810
UTILITIES IMPROVEMENTS	2,800	2,800	---	2,800
NAS WHITING FLD				
AIRCRAFT PARKING APRON	1,770	1,770	[illegible]	1,770
FAMILY SERVICES CENTER	480	480	---	480
LAND ACQUISITION	990	990	-990	---
OPERATIONAL TRAINER FAC	2,790	2,790	---	2,790
NAVAL ORD TEST UNIT-CAPE CANAVERAL				
TRIDENT II DEV FLT TEST FACILITY	60,400	55,000	-3,400	55,000
NCSC PANAMA CITY				
AIRCRAFT PARKING APRON	670	670	---	670
UNDERWATER WPNS LAB	---	5,400	---	---

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project (1)	DOD request (2)	House allowance (3)	SASC authorization compared to budget (4)	Committee recommendation (5)
NS MAYPORT				
GENERAL WAREHOUSE	4,250	4,250	---	4,250
UNACCOMP ENLISTED PERS HOUSING & DING FAC	14,400	14,400	---	14,400
UNACCOMP OFFICER PERS HOUSING	3,910	3,000	---	3,400
WATERFRONT UTIL UPGRADE	2,960	2,960	---	2,960
NTC ORLANDO				
APPLIED INSTRUCTION BLDG	7,540	7,540	---	7,540
SEWERAGE SYSTEM	2,760	2,760	---	2,760
UNACCOMP ENLISTED PERS HOUSING	9,390	9,390	---	9,390
NTTC PENSACOLA				
PUBLIC WORKS SHOP	210	210	---	210
CHAPEL	---	2,200	---	---
NAS PENSACOLA				
RUNWAY IMPR	---	2,200	---	---
AIR FORCE				
CAPE CANAVERAL AFS				
ADD TO/ALTER MISSILE ASSY BLDG-NAVSTAR GPS	4,500	4,500	---	4,500
HYPERGOLIC STOCKPILE STORAGE FAC	4,900	4,900	---	4,900
EASTERN LAUNCH SITE				
STS-SECURITY MODIFICATIONS	6,000	6,000	---	6,000
EGLIN AFB				
ADD TO/ALTER ARMAMENT RESEARCH TEST FAC	7,000	7,000	---	7,000
AIRCRAFT WASHRACK CANOPY	300	300	---	300
FLIGHTLINE SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS	490	490	---	490
VARIOUS AIR DEFENSE SIMULATION RADAR FACS	2,050	2,050	---	2,050
ADDITION TO REC GYM	---	---	---	---
HOMESTEAD AFB				
ADDN TO CHILD CARE CTR	680	680	---	680
ALTER AIRCRAFT WASHRACK	990	990	---	990
ALTER MECHANICAL/STRUCT	2,390	2,390	---	2,390
MACDILL AFB				
ADD TO CHAPEL CENTER	1,100	1,100	---	1,100
ADD TO/ALTER CHILD CARE CENTER	560	560	---	560
ADDITION TO WAREHOUSE	1,350	1,350	---	1,350
ALTER UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED PERSONNEL HSG	3,150	3,150	---	3,150
RADIO CONTROL SYSTEM	220	200	---	200
PATRICK AFB				
ALTER AF TECH APPLICATION CTR HDQTRS FAC	2,392	2,392	---	2,392
TYNDALL AFB				
AIRCRAFT WASHRACK CANOPY	360	360	---	360
DRONE PARKING & FAC	620	620	---	620
VARIOUS MAINTENANCE/OPNS TRAINING FACS	5,810	5,810	---	5,810
UOPH	---	---	(+4,600)	(4,600)
UEPH	---	---	(+4,500)	(4,500)
CIVIL ENGR. SCIENCE LAB	---	---	(+4,650)	(4,650)
EDUCATION CENTER	---	---	(+2,000)	(2,000)
BASE SUPPORT CENTER	---	---	(+6,500)	(6,500)
AIR NATIONAL GUARD				
JACKSONVILLE IAP				
ADD/ALT BLDG 5-SQ OPNS/TELECOMM/SEC POL/OP	1,760	1,760	---	1,760

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	DOD request	House allowance	SASC authorization compared to budget	Committee recommendation
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
AIR FORCE RESERVE				
HOMESTEAD AFB				
ADD TO SQUADRON OPNS	550	550	---	550
MACDILL AFB				
ADD/ALT RES FORCES AEROMED EVAC TRNG FAC	947	947	---	947
TOTAL, FLORIDA	196,819	192,789	+7,410	201,699
GEORGIA				
ARMY				
FORT BENNING				
AMMUNITION STORAGE	2,650	2,650	---	2,650
ENERGY MONITORING AND CONTROL SYSTEM	8,400	8,400	---	8,400
INFANTRY REMOTE TARGET SYSTEM RANGES	5,200	5,200	---	5,200
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	5,500	5,500	---	5,500
FT STEWART/HUNTER AAF				
BATTALION HEADQUARTERS AND CLASSROOM	2,600	2,600	---	2,600
BATTALION HEADQUARTERS AND CLASSROOM	1,400	1,400	---	1,400
COMPANY ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPLY	1,500	1,500	---	1,500
COMPANY ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPLY	430	430	---	430
ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	3,000	3,000	---	3,000
HARDSTAND	370	370	---	370
RELOCATE VANGUARD FACILITY	2,670	2,670	---	2,670
STEAM DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	6,500	6,500	---	6,500
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	8,800	8,800	---	8,800
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	2,450	2,450	---	2,450
NAVY				
SUBASE KINGS BAY				
COMMUNITY IMPACT ASSIST	400	400	---	400
FLOAT DRYDOCK MOOR FAC	8,600	---	-8,600	---
PORT SERVICES SUPPORT FACS	11,840	11,840	---	11,840
UTILITIES & SITE IMPROV	18,570	18,570	---	18,570
COMMUNITY IMPACT ASSIST	---	5,619	+5,619	5,619
TRIDENT TRAINING FACILITY	---	---	(+81,700)	(81,700)
AIR FORCE				
MOODY AFB				
SOUND SUPPRESSOR SUPPORT	950	950	---	950
VEHICLE OPERATIONS FACILITY	350	350	---	350
ROBINS AFB				
ADD TO/ALTER OFFENSIVE AVIONICS FACILITIES	1,350	---	-1,350	---
ALTER ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	3,000	3,000	---	3,000
AUTOMOTIVE MAINTENANCE FACILITY	4,600	4,600	---	4,600
COMBAT COMMUNICATION DEPLOYMENT FACILITY	4,200	4,200	---	4,200
OSH-UPGRADE FIRE PROT SYS	560	560	---	560
OSH-UPGRADE FIRE PROTECTION SYS	1,400	1,400	---	1,400
PAVE PAWS SUPPORT FAC	3,570	3,570	---	3,570
ALTER UEPH	---	---	(+1,450)	(1,450)
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD				
WAYCROSS				
ARMED FORCES RESERVE CENTER	377	377	---	377
ARMY RESERVE				
WAYCROSS				
ADD/ALT AFRC/OMS	533	533	---	533

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	DOD request	House allowance	SASC authorization compared to budget	Committee recommendation
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
AIR FORCE RESERVE				
DOBBINS AFB				
ADD TO ACFT ENGINE INSP & REPAIR SHOP	470	470	---	470
ADD TO WAREHOUSE	1,950	1,950	---	1,950
ADD/ALT SURVIVAL EQUIP SHOP	353	353	---	353
TOTAL, GEORGIA	114,543	110,212	-4,331	110,212
HAWAII				
ARMY				
SCHOFIELD BARRACKS				
BARRACKS WITH DINING FACILITY	16,400	16,400	---	16,400
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	5,100	5,100	---	5,100
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	6,200	6,200	---	6,200
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	2,200	2,200	---	2,200
UPGRADE PETROLEUM STORAGE	2,000	2,000	---	2,000
WAREHOUSE	1,800	---	-1,800	---
NAVY				
CAMP H M SMITH - OAHU				
UNACCOMP ENLISTED PERS HOUSING & DING FAC	2,700	2,700	---	2,700
FLEET INTELLIGENCE CTR PACIF PEARL HARBOR				
STAND-BY GENERATOR PLANT	1,823	990	-833	990
MARINE CORPS AIR STATION KANEOHE BAY				
AIRFIELD PAVEMENT IMPROVEMENTS	5,110	5,110	---	5,110
ARMORIES	2,790	2,790	---	2,790
NAS BARBERS PT				
FAMILY SERVICES CENTER	890	890	---	890
NAVAL REGIONAL MEDICAL CLINIC PEARL HARBOR				
MEDICAL/DENTAL CLINIC (MCAS KANEOHE BAY)	8,490	8,490	---	8,490
NAVAL SHIPYARD PEARL HARBOR				
ASBESTOS DELAGGING FACILITY	1,440	1,440	---	1,440
TRAINING FAC	---	4,600	---	---
SERVICE SHOPS	---	20,000	---	---
NAVAL STATION PEARL HARBOR				
OPERATIONS CONTROL CENTER	3,350	3,350	---	3,350
NAVAL SUBMARINE BASE PEARL HARBOR				
CHILD CARE CENTER	990	990	---	990
PIER IMPROVEMENTS	1,390	1,390	---	1,390
WATER STORAGE TANKS	210	210	---	210
PWC PEARL HARBOR				
UTILITIES IMPROVEMENTS	13,100	13,100	---	13,100
AIR FORCE				
HICKAM AFB				
CHILD CARE CTR	1,950	1,950	---	1,950
ENVIRONMENTAL MEDICINE FAC	1,200	1,200	---	1,200
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD				
WHEELER AFB				
ARMY AVIATION SUPPORT FACILITY EXPANSION	2,432	2,432	---	2,432
ARMORY ADDITION	57	57	---	57
AIR NATIONAL GUARD				
HICKAM AFB				
ADD TO ACFT PARKING APRON	990	990	---	990

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	DOD request	House allowance	SASC authorization compared to budget	Committee recommendation
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
ARMY RESERVE				
FORT DERUSSY				
ADDITION TO ARMY RESERVE CENTER	2,830	2,830	---	2,830
TOTAL, HAWAII	85,442	107,409	-2,633	82,809
IDAHO				
AIR FORCE				
MOUNTAIN HOME AFB				
ADD TO FLIGHT SIMULATOR TRAINING FACILITY	1,550	1,550	---	1,550
ADD TO GYMNASIUM	2,800	2,800	---	2,800
ADDITION TO TELECOMMUNICATIONS CENTER	530	530	---	530
ADDN TO CHILD CARE CENTER	800	800	---	800
ELECTRONIC WARFARE RANGE SUPPORT FAC	910	910	---	910
AIR NATIONAL GUARD				
BOISE APRT				
BASE ENGINEER MAINT	1,300	1,300	---	1,300
FIRE STATION	740	740	---	740
OPERATIONAL TRAINING FACILITY	2,800	2,800	---	2,800
TOTAL, IDAHO	11,430	11,430	---	11,430
ILLINOIS				
ARMY				
ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL				
BRIDGE REPAIR	---	---	(+4,500)	(4,500)
MODERNIZE MANUFACTURING FACILITY - REARM	22,000	13,000	---	22,000
AIR FORCE				
CHANUTE AFB				
ALTER STRUCTURAL	210	210	---	210
UPGRADE REGIONAL CONNECTION	10,000	10,000	---	10,000
HEAT PLANT	---	11,700	(+79,000)	(11,700)
SCOTT AFB				
ADD TO RELIGIOUS EDUC CTR	790	790	---	790
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD				
MARSEILLES				
SMALL ARMS RANGE	663	663	---	663
AIR NATIONAL GUARD				
CAPITAL MAP				
FIRE STATION SEC POLICE OPNS FAC	1,500	1,500	---	1,500
TOTAL, ILLINOIS	35,163	37,863	---	35,163
INDIANA				
ARMY				
FORT BENJ. HARRISON				
BARRACKS	---	---	(+5,900)	(5,900)
AIR FORCE				
GRISSOM AFB				
ADMINISTRATIVE FAC	500	---	---	---
PERS SUPPORT CTR	---	---	(+5,600)	(5,600)
DINING HALL	---	---	(+3,200)	(3,200)
ADD TO VEH MAINT SHOP	---	---	---	---

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project (1)	DOD request (2)	House allowance (3)	SASC authorization compared to budget (4)	Committee recommendation (5)
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD				
NOBLESVILLE				
60 PERSON ARMORY	704	704	---	704
SALEM				
100 PERSON ARMORY	813	813	---	813
AIR NATIONAL GUARD				
HULMAN FIELD				
WARM-UP/HOLDING PAD	1,250	1,250	---	1,250
ARMY RESERVE				
BLOOMINGTON				
ADDITION TO ARMED FORCES RESERVE CENTER	889	889	---	889
NAVY RESERVE				
NMCRC FORT WAYNE				
RESERVE CENTER ALTERATION	400	400	---	400
TOTAL, INDIANA	4,556	4,056	---	4,056
KANSAS				
ARMY				
KANSAS AAP				
SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT	1,150	1,150	---	1,150
FORT LEAVENWORTH				
PHYSICAL FITNESS TRAINING CENTER	3,550	3,550	---	3,550
UNACCOMPANIED OFFICER HOUSING	24,000	24,000	-14,000	10,000
FORT RILEY				
AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE FACILITY	8,100	8,100	---	8,100
BARRACKS	6,300	6,300	-6,300	---
BARRACKS	4,500	---	-4,500	---
BARRACKS WITH DINING FACILITY	8,400	8,400	-8,400	---
BATTALION HEADQUARTERS AND CLASSROOM	1,200	1,200	---	1,200
BATTALION HEADQUARTERS AND CLASSROOM	1,200	1,200	---	1,200
BRIGADE HEADQUARTERS	1,400	1,400	---	1,400
BULK FUEL STORAGE FACILITY	3,000	3,000	---	3,000
COMPANY ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPLY	1,700	1,700	---	1,700
COMPANY ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPLY	2,150	2,150	---	2,150
COMPANY ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPLY	1,500	1,500	---	1,500
CORRECT SAFETY DEFICIENCIES	1,300	1,300	---	1,300
DINING FACILITY MODERNIZATION	600	600	---	600
ELECTRICAL SUBSTATION	1,400	1,400	-1,400	---
MULTI-PURPOSE TRAINING RANGE	31,000	31,000	---	31,000
SEWAGE TREATMENT AND WATER UPGRADE	6,500	6,500	-6,500	---
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	5,000	5,000	---	5,000
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	1,200	1,200	---	1,200
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	3,950	3,950	---	3,950
UTILITIES	5,400	5,400	---	5,400
AIR FORCE				
MCCONNELL AFB				
ENVIR MONITORING & CONTROL SYS (EMCS)	2,430	2,430	---	2,430
OSH-FUEL CELL REPAIR SHOP-DELUGE SYS	410	410	---	410
UEPH	---	5,500	---	---
AIR FIELD LIGHTING	---	1,230	---	---

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project (1)	DOD request (2)	House allowance (3)	SASC authorization compared to budget (4)	Committee recommendation (5)
AIR NATIONAL GUARD				
MCCONNELL AFB				
COMM/ELECTRONICS TRNG FAC	1,100	1,100	---	1,100
FUEL SYS MAINT/CORROSION CONTROL DOCK	1,810	1,810	---	1,810
TOTAL, KANSAS	130,250	132,480	-41,100	89,150
KENTUCKY				
ARMY				
FORT CAMPBELL				
BATTALION HEADQUARTERS AND CLASSROOM	1,300	1,300	---	1,300
DINING FACILITY MODERNIZATION	2,050	2,050	---	2,050
ENERGY MONITORING AND CONTROL SYSTEM	3,600	3,600	---	3,600
FLIGHT SIMULATOR BUILDING	5,500	5,500	---	5,500
SOLID WASTE INCINERATOR	4,950	---	-4,950	---
UPGRADE WATER SUPPLY	2,850	2,850	---	2,850
FORT KNOX				
TANK INSTRUCTION FACILITY	4,200	4,200	---	4,200
AIR NATIONAL GUARD				
STANDIFORD FLD				
FIRE SUPPRESSION/DETECTION	750	750	---	750
TOTAL, KENTUCKY	25,200	20,250	-4,950	20,250
LOUISIANA				
ARMY				
LOUISIANA AAP				
PINK WATER FILTRATION SYSTEM	4,250	4,250	---	4,250
FORT POLK				
CHILD CARE CENTER	3,000	3,000	---	3,000
DYNAMOMETER TEST FACILITY	380	380	---	380
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	12,800	12,800	---	12,800
AIR FORCE				
BARKSDALE AFB				
ADD TO/ALTER CHILD CARE CENTER	670	670	---	670
ALTER UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED PERSONNEL HSG	4,500	4,500	---	4,500
HYDRANT REFUELING/CENTRAL AIRCRAFT SPT SYS	15,000	15,000	---	15,000
ENGLAND AFB				
ADD TO/ALTER COMPOSITE MEDICAL FAC	500	500	---	500
ADMINISTRATIVE FAC	500	---	---	---
CONSOLIDATED SUPPORT CENTER	2,500	2,500	---	2,500
RADIO CONTROL-ALTER MECHANICAL/ELECTRICAL	390	357	---	357
NAVY RESERVE				
NAS NEW ORLEANS				
MODIFICATIONS TO BLDG AND AC SYSTEMS	150	150	---	150
SEWAGE TREATMENT FACILITY	2,400	2,400	---	2,400
NAVAL SUPPORT ACTIVITY NEW ORLEANS				
CHAPEL	1,500	1,500	---	1,500
MODIFICATIONS TO BLDG AND AC SYSTEMS	350	350	---	350
AIR FORCE RESERVE				
NEW ORLEANS NAS				
POWER CHECK PAD	523	523	---	523
TOTAL, LOUISIANA	49,413	48,880	---	48,880

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project (1)	DOD request (2)	House allowance (3)	SASC authorization compared to budget (4)	Committee recommendation (5)
MAINE				
NAVY				
NAVAL AIR STATION BRUNSWICK				
OPERATIONS CONTROL CENTER	7,800	7,800	---	7,800
NSY PORTSMOUTH				
VENTILATION IMPR	---	1,400	---	---
FIRE PROT SYS	---	5,700	---	---
AIR FORCE				
BANGOR				
OVER THE HORIZON-BACKSCATTER RADAR SPT FAC	10,100	---	---	10,100
LORING AFB				
ADD TO/ALTER CREW FACILITY	4,000	4,000	---	4,000
ADD TO/ALTER OFFENSIVE AVIONICS FACILITY	500	500	---	500
ALERT RUNWAY	16,000	16,000	---	16,000
COMPOSITE MAINTENANCE COMPLEX	4,100	4,100	---	4,100
UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED PERSONNEL HOUSING	4,800	4,800	---	4,800
UPGRADE ALERT AREA	7,000	7,000	---	7,000
AIR NATIONAL GUARD				
BANGOR IAP				
COMPOSITE OPERATIONAL TRAINING FACILITY	2,200	2,200	---	2,200
TOTAL, MAINE	56,500	53,500	---	56,500
MARYLAND				
ARMY				
ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND				
MEDICAL RESEARCH LABORATORY ALTERATIONS	3,650	3,650	-3,650	---
REPLACE GAS FILTER SYSTEM	17,500	17,500	---	17,500
WEAPONS MAINTENANCE TRAINING FACILITY	8,900	8,900	---	8,900
UEPH	---	9,800	---	---
FORT DETRICK				
COMMUNICATIONS CENTER ADDITION	1,650	1,650	---	1,650
FORT GEORGE G MEADE				
SATELLITE TERMINAL FACILITY ADDITION	1,250	1,250	---	1,250
WATER WELLS	3,900	3,900	---	3,900
HARRY DIAMOND LAB				
TEST FACILITY ALTERATION	400	400	---	400
NAVY				
DAVID TAYLOR NAV SHIP RES DEV CTR BETHESDA				
COMPUTATION & ANALYSIS LAB	5,030	---	---	5,030
NATIONAL NAVAL MEDICAL CENTER BETHESDA				
NATIONAL NAVAL MEDICAL CENTER MODERN	28,000	28,000	---	28,000
UNACCOMP ENLISTED PERS HOUSING	8,370	7,000	---	8,370
NAVAL ACADEMY ANNAPOLIS				
BOAT BASIN IMPROVEMENTS	3,070	3,070	-3,070	---
UTILITIES MODERNIZATION	6,650	6,650	---	6,650
NAVAL AIR TEST CENTER PATUXENT RIVER				
AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS INTEGRATION LABORATORY	4,930	4,930	---	4,930
CHILD CARE CENTER	1,320	1,100	---	1,100
ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM MODERN	3,900	3,900	---	3,900
NAVAL ORDNANCE STATION INDIAN HEAD				
UNACCOMP ENLISTED PERS HOUSING MODN	1,950	1,950	---	1,950
NAVAL STATION ANNAPOLIS				
FAMILY SERVICES CENTER	405	---	---	---

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project (1)	DOD request (2)	House allowance (3)	SASC authorization compared to budget (4)	Committee recommendation (5)
AIR FORCE				
ANDREWS AFB				
OSH-FIRE PROTECTION SPRINKLER SYS	2,200	1,786	-414	1,786
DEFENSE AGENCIES				
ARMED FCS RADIOBIOLOGY RES INST BETHESDA				
UPGRADE MECH & ELECT SYSTEMS	10,900	10,900	---	10,900
DMA HYDROGRAPHIC/TOPOGRAPHIC CENTER				
ENERGY CONSERVATION PROJECTS	1,830	1,830	---	1,830
FORT HOLABIRD				
REPLACE LIGHTING & CEILING	210	210	---	210
FORT MEADE				
CHEMICAL STORAGE BUILDING	420	420	---	420
MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT BUILDING	565	565	---	565
METAL RECLAMATION BUILDING	675	675	---	675
SPECIAL PROCESSING LABS	27,840	24,840	---	27,840
TOXIC CHEMICAL TREATMENT	1,500	1,500	---	1,500
AIR NATIONAL GUARD				
GLENN L MARTIN APRT				
AERIAL PORT TRAINING FAC	990	990	---	990
TOTAL, MARYLAND	148,805	148,166	-7,134	141,046
MASSACHUSETTS				
ARMY				
FT DEVENS				
CHILD CARE FAC	---	3,000	(+3,000)	(3,000)
AIR FORCE				
HANSCOM AFB				
ADD TO TELECOMMUNICATIONS FAC	480	480	---	480
ALTER MECHANICAL	940	940	---	940
PAYLOAD VERIFICATION/INTERPRETATION FAC	2,250	2,250	---	2,250
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD				
TAUNTON				
200 PERSON ARMORY	1,291	1,291	---	1,291
NAVY RESERVE				
NAS SOUTH WEYMOUTH				
TRAINING BLDG	350	350	---	---
MAIN GATE RELOC	---	1,400	---	---
AIR FORCE RESERVE				
WESTOVER AFB				
FIRE TRAINING FAC	325	325	---	325
TOTAL, MASSACHUSETTS	5,636	10,036	---	5,286
MICHIGAN				
ARMY				
DETROIT ARSENAL				
ENERGY EFFICIENT LIGHTING	270	270	---	270
NAVY				
NAVAL TRANSMITTER FACILITY REPUBLIC				
TRANSMITTER FAC & LAND ACQ	13,000	13,000	---	13,000

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project (1)	DOD request (2)	House allowance (3)	SASC authorization compared to budget (4)	Committee recommendation (5)
AIR FORCE				
K I SAWYER AFB				
ADD TO HEAT PLANT	35,000	35,000	(+35,000)	(35,000)
ADD TO/ALTER OFFENSIVE AVIONICS FACILITY	950	950	---	950
VARIOUS OPS/MAINT/TRNG FAC	5,510	4,510	-1,000	4,510
WURTSMITH AFB				
ALTER UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED PERSONNEL HSG	5,000	5,000	---	5,000
DEFENSE AGENCIES				
DEFENSE FUEL SUPPORT POINT ESCANABA				
FIRE PROTECTION	1,000	1,000	---	1,000
ARMY RESERVE				
TRAVERSE CITY				
ADDITION TO ARMY RESERVE CENTER	1,303	1,303	---	1,303
TOTAL, MICHIGAN	62,033	61,033	-1,000	26,033
MINNESOTA				
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD				
BLOOMINGTON				
200 PERSON ARMORY	1,435	1,435	---	1,435
ST. PAUL				
RENOVATE ARMORY	---	647	---	---
AVIATION FLT FAC	---	1,633	---	---
AIR NATIONAL GUARD				
DULUTH IAP				
FIRE STATION	960	960	---	960
MINN-ST PAUL				
BASE SUPPLY/EQUIP WHSE&COMPTROLLER FAC	2,600	2,600	---	2,600
AIR FORCE RESERVE				
MINN-ST PAUL IAP				
COMPOSITE TRAINING FAC	1,845	1,845	---	1,845
TOTAL, MINNESOTA	6,840	9,120	---	6,840
MISSISSIPPI				
NAVY				
NAVAL AIR STATION MERIDIAN				
FAMILY SERVICES CENTER	610	610	---	610
NAVAL CONSTRUCTION BATTALION CTR GULFPORT				
UNACCOMP ENLISTED PERS HOUSING	2,960	2,960	---	2,960
NAVAL OCEANOGRAPHIC OFFICE BAY SAINT LOUIS				
COMPUTER PROGRAMMING OPERATIONS CENTER	6,320	6,320	---	6,320
NAVAL SPACE SURVEIL FIELD STA HOLLANDALE				
SPACE SURVEILLANCE ANTENNA	495	495	---	495
AIR FORCE				
COLUMBUS AFB				
ALTER UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED PERSONNEL HSG	1,650	1,650	---	1,650
PHEL LABORATORY	---	---	(+530)	(530)
KEESLER AFB				
AIRCRAFT CORROSION CONTROL FACILITY	420	420	---	420
UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED PERSONNEL HOUSING	5,900	5,900	---	5,900
COMPUTER TRAINING FACILITY	---	---	(+11,900)	(11,900)
UEPH W/DINING HALL	---	---	(+6,400)	(6,400)

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	DOD request	House allowance	SASC authorization compared to budget	Committee recommendation
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD				
CAMP SHELBY				
RANGE IMPROVEMENTS, PHASE 2D	1,613	1,613	---	1,613
LAND ACQUISITION II	---	2,914	---	---
CLINTON				
60 PERSON ARMORY	498	498	---	498
GLOSTER				
60 PERSON ARMORY	---	---	+575	575
FLOWOOD				
ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP	383	383	---	383
INDIANOLA				
60 PERSON ARMORY	---	---	+572	572
ROLLING FORK				
60 PERSON ARMORY	---	572	+572	572
ARMY RESERVE				
GREENVILLE				
ARMY RESERVE CENTER-MAINTENANCE SHOP	1,880	1,880	---	1,880
JACKSON				
ADD.TO ARMY RES CEN-MAINT SHOP/SUPPORT ACT	2,371	2,371	---	2,371
LAUREL				
ARMY RESERVE CENTER	---	---	+3,000	3,000
TOTAL, MISSISSIPPI	25,100	28,586	+4,719	29,819
MISSOURI				
ARMY				
FORT LEONARD WOOD				
MAINTENANCE COMPLEX PHASE II	12,600	12,600	---	12,600
AIR FORCE				
WHITEMAN AFB				
TWO UEPH	---	8,600	(+8,200)	(8,200)
DINING HALL	---	3,300	(+3,300)	(3,300)
HEATING PLANT	---	1,800	(+1,800)	(1,800)
MISSILE MAINT FAC	---	7,900	---	---
VEHICLE MAINT FAC	---	---	(+2,000)	(2,000)
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD				
KENNETT				
60 PERSON ARMORY	728	728	---	728
LEBANON				
60 PERSON ARMORY	794	794	---	794
SAINT JOSEPH				
100 PERSON ARMORY	1,070	1,070	---	1,070
ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP	347	347	---	347
TOTAL, MISSOURI	15,539	37,139	---	15,539
MONTANA				
AIR FORCE				
FORSYTH				
STRATEGIC TNG RANGE COMPLEX-SITE3/LAND ACR	4,770	4,225	-545	4,225
HAVRE				
STRATEGIC TNG RANGE COMPLEX-SITE2/LAND ACQ	4,970	4,936	-34	4,936
MALMSTROM AFB				
ADD TO/ALTER CHILD CARE CENTER	630	630	---	630

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	DOD request	House allowance	SASC authorization compared to budget	Committee recommendation
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
ARMY RESERVE				
BUTTE				
EXP ARMORY TO RESERVE CEN-MAINT.SHOP	985	985	---	985
TOTAL, MONTANA	11,355	10,776	-579	10,776
NEBRASKA				
AIR FORCE				
OFFUTT AFB				
ADD TO AIR COND AF GLOBAL WEATHER CTRL	710	710	---	710
ADMINISTRATIVE FAC	500	---	---	---
AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE FACILITIES-PHASE I	26,900	---	---	26,900
OSH-CORRECT ASBESTOS HAZARDS	1,300	1,300	---	1,300
UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED PERSONNEL HOUSING	5,400	5,400	---	5,400
WEATHERIZATION	210	210	---	210
UOPH	---	---	(+4,000)	(4,000)
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD				
HASTINGS				
QTRS/DINING FACILITY/UTILITIES	1,031	1,031	---	1,031
ARMY RESERVE				
OMAHA				
REHAB.RESERVE CEN-MAINT SHOP-SUPPORT ACTS	4,202	4,202	---	4,202
TOTAL, NEBRASKA	40,253	12,853	---	39,753
NEVADA				
NAVY				
NAVAL AIR STATION FALLON				
AIRFIELD PAVEMENTS	11,900	11,900	---	11,900
AIR FORCE				
NELLIS AFB				
ADD TO/ALTER CHILD CARE CENTER	1,050	1,050	---	1,050
ALTER MECH/ELECT	440	440	---	440
ALTER UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED PERSONNEL HSG	3,000	3,000	---	3,000
RELOC POWER LINE/LAND ACQ	175	---	-175	---
TOTAL, NEVADA	16,565	16,390	-175	16,390
NEW HAMPSHIRE				
NAVY				
NSY PORTSMOUTH				
VENTILATION IMPROVEMENTS	---	---	+1,900	1,400
FIRE PROTECTION	---	---	+5,700	5,700
AIR FORCE				
PEASE AFB				
BASE CIVIL ENG. MAINT. COMPLEX	---	---	(+7,200)	(7,200)
TOTAL, NEW HAMPSHIRE	---	---	+7,600	7,100

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project (1)	DOD request (2)	House allowance (3)	SASC authorization compared to budget (4)	Committee recommendation (5)
NEW JERSEY				
ARMY				
FORT MONMOUTH				
PULSE POWER CENTER	12,400	12,400	-12,400	---
ELEC DISTR SYS	---	2,500	---	---
PICATINNY ARSENAL				
COMPUTER CENTER MODERNIZATION	460	460	---	460
NAVY				
FT DIX AEGIS COMBAT SYS ENGINEER DEV SITE				
UNACCOMP ENLISTED PERS HOUSING & DING FAC	2,040	2,040	-2,040	---
NAVAL AIR ENGINEERING CENTER LAKEHURST				
SAFETY ALARM SYSTEM	475	475	---	475
UNACCOMP ENLISTED PERS HOUSING	3,720	3,720	---	3,720
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION EARLE				
TORPEDO SHOP ADDITION	465	465	---	465
AIR FORCE				
MCGUIRE AFB				
TAXIWAY LIGHTING	620	620	---	620
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD				
WOODBURY				
ARMORY ADDITION	1,294	1,294	---	1,294
AIR NATIONAL GUARD				
ATLANTIC CITY				
OPNL TRNG/MED TRNG & ADMIN/DINING HALL FAC	2,780	2,780	---	2,780
AIR FORCE RESERVE				
MCGUIRE AFB				
ADD TO RES FORCES AEROMED TRAINING FAC	1,430	1,430	---	1,430
TOTAL, NEW JERSEY	25,684	28,184	-14,440	11,244
NEW MEXICO				
ARMY				
WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE				
PHYSICAL FITNESS TRAINING CENTER ADDITION	310	310	---	310
AIR FORCE				
CANNON AFB				
CONSOLIDATED SUPPORT CENTER	6,800	6,800	(+6,800)	(6,800)
HOLLOMAN AFB				
ADD TO ARCFT AMNT. UNIT	---	---	(+600)	(600)
ADD TO ENGINE INST. & REPAIR	---	---	(+1,000)	(1,000)
ARCFT CORROSION CONTROL	---	---	(+1,400)	(1,400)
ALTER UEPH	---	---	(+3,100)	(3,100)
AIRMEN DINING HALL	---	---	(+3,000)	(3,000)
AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE HANGER	---	---	(+7,700)	(7,700)
MUNITIONS STORAGE	---	---	(+3,700)	(3,700)
KIRTLAND AFB				
ADD TO /ALTER FIRE STATION	670	670	---	670
ADD TO/ALTER PRECISION MEASUREMENT EQ LAB	970	970	---	970
ALTER ELECTRICAL/MECHANICAL	600	600	---	600
TOTAL, NEW MEXICO	9,350	9,350	---	2,550

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	DOD request	House allowance	SASC authorization compared to budget	Committee recommendation
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
NEW YORK				
ARMY				
FORT DRUM				
RECREATION CENTER	1,500	1,500	---	1,500
U S MILITARY ACADEMY				
BARRACKS MODERNIZATION	8,100	8,100	---	8,100
ENERGY EFFICIENT LIGHTING	360	360	---	360
ENERGY MONITORING AND CONTROL SYSTEM	480	480	---	480
LAND ACQUISITION-LADYCLIFF	3,450	3,450	---	---
WEATHER STRIPPING	450	450	---	450
WATERVLIET ARSENAL				
LABORATORY	---	---	---	---
AIR FORCE				
GRIFFISS AFB				
ADD TO/ALTER ELECTRONIC RESEARCH TEST FAC	2,250	2,250	-2,250	---
AIR LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE IGLOO	1,300	1,300	---	1,300
OSH-DELUGE SYS IN ACFT HANGAR COMPLEX	2,150	2,150	---	2,150
UEPH	---	6,700	---	---
FT HAMILTON				
ADMINISTRATION FACILITY	500	---	-500	---
PLATTSBURGH AFB				
CHILD CARE CTR	1,100	1,100	---	1,100
WEATHERIZATION/ALTER MECHANICAL	790	665	---	665
PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER	---	---	---	---
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD				
LATHAM				
600 PERSON ARMORY	2,727	4,577	---	2,727
US PROPERTY & FISCAL OFFICER	1,289	1,289	---	1,289
MAINT SHOP	---	494	---	---
BUFFALO				
ARMORY RESTORATION	---	---	---	---
MAINT SHOP	---	424	---	---
AIR NATIONAL GUARD				
HANCOCK FLD				
AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE DOCK	1,340	1,340	---	1,340
DINING HALL	900	900	---	900
NIAGARA FALLS				
ADD/ALT BLDG 906 FOR SUPPORT EQUIP SHOP	530	530	---	530
SQUADRON OPERATIONS FACILITY	1,540	1,540	---	1,540
STEWART AIRFIELD				
ACFT BEDDOWN	---	29,200	---	---
SUFFOLK COUNTY AIRPORT				
COMPOSITE SQ OPNS/MAINT CONTROL FAC	2,230	2,230	---	2,230
ARMY RESERVE				
AMITYVILLE				
ARMED FORCES RESERVE CEN-MAINT ACTIVITY	2,084	2,084	---	2,084
FORT DRUM				
EQUIPMENT SITE-MAINTENANCE ACTIVITY	4,373	4,373	---	4,373
NAVY RESERVE				
ARMED FORCES RESERVE CENTER AMITYVILLE				
RESERVE TRAINING BUILDING	3,100	3,100	---	3,100

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	DOD request	House allowance	SASC authorization compared to budget	Committee recommendation
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
AIR FORCE RESERVE				
NIAGARA FALLS IAP				
VEHICLE OPERATIONS HEATED PARKING	510	510	---	510
TOTAL, NEW YORK	43,053	81,096	-2,750	36,728
NORTH CAROLINA				
ARMY				
FORT BRAGG				
BARRACKS	12,000	12,000	---	12,000
CHILD CARE CENTERS	4,400	4,400	---	4,400
DINING FACILITY MODERNIZATION	1,800	1,800	---	1,800
FIELD OPERATIONS FACILITY	2,600	2,600	---	2,600
INTELLIGENCE TRAINING FACILITY	1,200	1,200	---	1,200
PHYSICAL FITNESS TRAINING CENTER	2,800	2,800	---	2,800
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	6,300	6,300	---	6,300
NAVY				
MARINE CORPS AIR STATION CHERRY POINT				
MAINTENANCE SHOPS	1,530	1,530	---	1,530
VENTILATION IMPROVEMENTS	275	275	---	275
MARINE CORPS AIR STATION NEW RIVER				
ENLISTED DINING FACILITY ADDITION	1,530	1,530	---	1,530
RADAR AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL CENTER	1,200	1,200	---	1,200
MARINE CORPS BASE CAMP LEJEUNE				
AMPHIBIOUS VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP	6,790	6,790	---	6,790
COMBAT VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOPS	6,420	6,420	---	6,420
ELECTRONICS/COMMUNICATION MAINT SHOP	335	335	---	335
SEWERAGE SYSTEM	455	455	---	455
UNACCOMP ENLISTED PERS HOUSING	14,800	14,800	---	14,800
UTILITY IMPROVEMENTS	2,960	2,960	---	2,960
NAVAL AIR REWORK FACILITY CHERRY POINT				
AIRCRAFT POWER CHECK FACILITY	4,740	4,740	---	4,740
AUTOMATIC PLATING FACILITY	15,300	15,300	---	15,300
AIR FORCE				
POPE AFB				
ADD TO/ALTER RECREATION CENTER	1,700	1,700	---	1,700
BASE TRANSPORTATION COMPLEX	---	---	(+3,700)	(3,700)
COMPTOLLER SERVICES CTR	1,100	1,100	---	1,100
SEYMOUR JOHNSON AFB				
ADD TO/ALTER CHILD CARE CENTER	690	690	---	690
AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE DOCK	4,550	4,550	---	4,550
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD				
FORT BRAGG				
MOBILIZATION & TRAINING EQUIPMENT SITE	1,000	1,000	---	1,000
PARKTON				
60 PERSON ARMORY	493	493	---	493
AIR NATIONAL GUARD				
BADIN ANGS				
COMMUNICATION/ELECTRONIC TRAINING FACILITY	1,500	1,500	---	1,500
DOUGLAS MAP				
FIRE STATION	1,050	1,050	---	1,050
TOTAL, NORTH CAROLINA	99,518	99,518	---	99,518

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	DOD request	House allowance	SASC authorization compared to budget	Committee recommendation
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
NORTH DAKOTA				
AIR FORCE				
GRAND FORKS AFB				
ADD TO EDUC CTR	1,100	1,100	---	1,100
ALTER UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED PERSONNEL HSG	6,935	6,935	---	6,935
AMBULANCE GARAGE/MEDICAL LOGISTICS FAC	490	490	---	490
MINOT AFB				
ALTER UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED PERSONNEL HSG	7,100	7,100	---	7,100
COMPOSITE MEDICAL FAC	38,000	---	-38,000	---
VARIOUS MAINT/OPS/TNG FAC	7,700	6,700	-1,000	6,700
TOTAL, NORTH DAKOTA	61,325	22,325	-39,000	22,325
OHIO				
AIR FORCE				
NEWARK AFS				
SYSTEMS METROLOGY ENGINEERING LABORATORY	800	800	---	800
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB				
ADD TO WATER SUPPLY AND STORAGE SYS	800	800	---	800
ADD TO/ALTER VIVARIUM	510	510	---	510
ALTER ELECTRONIC RESEARCH LABORATORY	600	600	---	600
ALTER STRUCTURAL/MECHANICAL	700	613	---	613
OSH-ADD TO/ALTER AIRCRAFT CORROSION CNTROL	3,400	3,400	---	3,400
DEFENSE AGENCIES				
DEFENSE FUEL SUPPORT POINT CINCINNATI				
NEW FUEL PIER	3,200	3,200	-3,200	---
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD				
CAMP PERRY				
TRAINING FACILITIES	---	---	+365	365
AIR NATIONAL GUARD				
RICKENBACKER AFB				
ALTER BLDG 863-MEDICAL TRNG/ADMIN FACILITY	350	350	---	350
CREW READINESS FACILITY	500	500	---	500
AIR FORCE RESERVE				
RICKENBACKER ANGB				
ALTER BLDG 863-MEDICAL TRAINING/ADMIN FAC	350	350	---	350
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB				
FUEL SYS MAINT DOCK	1,585	1,585	---	1,585
YOUNGSTOWN MAP				
FIRE STATION	1,700	1,700	---	1,700
VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP	1,376	1,376	---	1,376
TOTAL, OHIO	15,871	15,784	-2,835	12,949
OKLAHOMA				
ARMY				
FORT SILL				
WEAPONS TRAINING FACILITY	2,150	2,150	---	2,150
UEPH	---	23,000	(+23,000)	(23,000)

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project (1)	DOD request (2)	House allowance (3)	SASC authorization compared to budget (4)	Committee recommendation (5)
AIR FORCE				
ALTUS AFB				
AIRLIFT TRAINING CENTER	16,500	16,500	---	16,500
CONSOL OPNS/MAINT FAC	---	3,400	---	---
UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED PERSONNEL HOUSING	1,700	1,700	---	1,700
TINKER AFB				
ALTER MECHANICAL	720	720	---	720
CLOTHING SALES STORE	700	---	-700	---
EMERGENCY BACK-UP POWER	2,850	2,850	---	2,850
FLYING TRAINING CLASSROOM	2,500	2,500	---	2,500
SQUADRON OPERATIONS FACILITY	760	760	---	760
UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED PERSONNEL HOUSING	2,200	2,200	---	2,200
ALTER F-107 ENG. FAC	---	---	(+420)	(420)
COMBAT COMM. HQTRS	---	---	(+720)	(720)
COMM. ELECT INSTALLATION FAC	---	---	(+960)	(960)
VANCE AFB				
ENERGY MONITORING CONTROL SYS EXPANSION	1,250	1,250	---	1,250
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD				
EL RENO				
60 PERSON ARMORY	630	630	---	630
IDABEL				
60 PERSON ARMORY	---	612	+612	612
ARMY RESERVE				
OKLAHOMA CITY (KRONSE)				
ADDITION TO ARMY RESERVE CENTER	3,952	3,952	---	3,952
TOTAL, OKLAHOMA	35,912	62,224	-88	35,824
OREGON				
AIR FORCE RESERVE				
PORTLAND IAP				
ACFT MAINT HANGAR	1,905	1,905	---	1,905
AEROSPACE GND EQ ENGINE INSPEC/REPAIR SHOP	1,000	1,000	---	1,000
COMPOSITE MAINT FAC	1,830	1,830	---	1,830
TOTAL, OREGON	4,735	4,735	---	4,735
PENNSYLVANIA				
ARMY				
CARLISLE BARRACKS				
PHYSICAL FITNESS TRAINING CENTER WITH POOL	3,700	1,500	-3,700	---
LETTERKENNY ARMY DEPOT				
HEAT RECOVERY INCINERATOR	1,600	---	-1,600	---
TOBYHANNA ARMY DEPOT				
SHELTER HANDLING FACILITY	9,200	9,200	-9,200	---
NAVY				
NAVY SHIPS PARTS CONTROL CTR MECHANICSBURG				
DATA PROCESSING CENTER	15,800	15,800	-15,800	---
NSY PHILADELPHIA				
BERTHING WHARF IMPR	---	2,600	---	---
NSSES PHILADELPHIA				
EVAL TEST FAC	---	14,500	---	---

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	DOD request	House allowance	SASC authorization compared to budget	Committee recommendation
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
DEFENSE AGENCIES				
DEFENSE DEPOT MECHANICSBURG				
INTEGRATED MATERIAL HANDLING COMPLEX	18,000	18,000	-18,000	---
AIR NATIONAL GUARD				
HARRISBURG IAP				
BASE SUPPLIES & EQUIP WHSE	2,400	2,400	---	2,400
WILLOW GROVE NAS				
AUTO MAINT/SUPPORT EQUIP SHOP	1,100	1,100	---	1,100
COMM/ELECTRONICS TRNG FAC-MOBILITY STORAGE	2,200	2,200	---	2,200
ARMY RESERVE				
LOCK HAVEN				
RESERVE CEN-MAINTEN SHOP-SUPPORT ACTIVITY	3,191	3,191	---	3,191
NAVY RESERVE				
NAS WILLOW GROVE				
ACFT APPROACH LIGHTS	---	250	---	---
HANGAR FIRE PROT	---	300	---	---
AIR FORCE RESERVE				
WILLOW GROVE ARF				
ALT RES FORCES OPNS & TRNG FAC	495	495	---	495
VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY	1,028	1,028	---	1,028
TOTAL, PENNSYLVANIA	58,714	72,564	-48,300	10,414
RHODE ISLAND				
NAVY				
NAVAL EDUCATION & TRAINING CENTER NEWPORT				
ACADEMIC INSTRUCTION BUILDING ALTERATIONS	910	910	---	910
ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION LINES	200	200	---	200
PIER UTILITIES	3,160	3,160	-3,160	---
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD				
MIDDLETOWN				
100 PERSON ARMORY	922	922	---	922
TOTAL, RHODE ISLAND	5,192	5,192	-3,160	2,032
SOUTH CAROLINA				
ARMY				
FORT JACKSON				
ENERGY DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM MODERNIZATION	790	790	---	790
EDUCATION CENTER	---	---	(+5,200)	(5,200)
CHAPEL/CHILD CARE CENTER	---	---	(+6,400)	(6,400)
TRAINEE BARRACKS	---	---	(+26,800)	(26,800)
NAVY				
MARINE CORPS AIR STATION BEAUFORT				
AIRCRAFT SUPPORT FACILITIES	1,030	1,030	---	1,030
MAINTENANCE HANGAR MODERNIZATION	1,390	1,390	---	1,390
TACTICAL SUPPORT VAN PADS	1,110	1,110	---	1,110
NAVAL STATION CHARLESTON				
BERTHING PIER	39,250	36,000	---	36,000
FIRE PROTECTION PIPELINE	---	---	+3,900	3,900

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project (1)	DOD request (2)	House allowance (3)	SASC authorization compared to budget (4)	Committee recommendation (5)
NSY CHARLESTON				
ELEC DISTR SYS IMPR	---	---	+15,000	15,000
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION CHARLESTON				
CHILD CARE CENTER	1,570	1,570	---	1,570
AIR FORCE				
CHARLESTON AFB				
COMPOSITE WING FACILITY	---	---	(+3,200)	(3,200)
MYRTLE BEACH AFB				
ALTER MECHANICAL/ELECTRICAL	270	250	---	250
MISSILE MAINTENANCE SHOP	1,300	1,300	---	1,300
SHAW AFB				
ALTER UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED PERSONNEL HSG	2,450	2,450	---	2,450
BASE ENGINEER FAC	7,100	7,100	---	7,100
RADIO CONTROL-ALTER MECHANICAL/ELECTRICAL	490	440	---	440
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD				
DARLINGTON				
100 PERSON ARMORY	908	908	---	908
TIMMONSVILLE				
100 PERSON ARMORY	814	814	---	814
AIR NATIONAL GUARD				
MCENTIRE				
BASE SUPPLIES & EQUIP WHSE/MOBILITY STOR	2,240	2,240	---	2,240
FIRE STATION	1,050	1,050	---	1,050
TOTAL, SOUTH CAROLINA	61,762	58,442	+18,900	77,342
SOUTH DAKOTA				
AIR FORCE				
ELLSWORTH AFB				
UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED PERSONNEL HOUSING	6,700	6,700	---	6,700
TOTAL, SOUTH DAKOTA	6,700	6,700	---	6,700
TENNESSEE				
ARMY				
MILAN AAP				
RUNOFF COLLECTION/TREATMENT SYSTEM	550	550	---	550
NAVY				
NAVAL AIR STATION MEMPHIS-MILLINGTON				
APPLIED INSTRUCTION BUILDING	4,650	4,650	---	4,650
MUNICIPAL SEWER CONNECTION	7,150	7,150	---	7,150
AIR FORCE				
ARNOLD ENGINEERING DEV CENTER				
ALTER MECH/STRUC/ELEC	670	670	---	670
ANECHOIC CHAMBER	200	---	-200	---
CAPTIVE TRAJECTORY SUP SYS-PROPWIND TUNNEL	7,400	7,400	---	7,400
CONVERT TO PRECISION MACHINE SHOP	1,600	1,600	---	1,600
SOLID PROPELLANT STORAGE FAC	2,500	2,500	---	2,500
FIRE PROTECTION BULK FUEL	---	---	(+382)	(382)
DEFENSE AGENCIES				
DEFENSE DEPOT MEMPHIS				
ENCLOSE BUILDING 942	750	750	---	750

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project (1)	DOD request (2)	House allowance (3)	SASC authorization compared to budget (4)	Committee recommendation (5)
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD				
DAYTON				
60 PERSON ARMORY	706	706	---	706
MURFREESBORO				
100 PERSON ARMORY	899	899	---	899
WAYNESBORO				
60 PERSON ARMORY	690	690	---	690
LEBANON				
ARMORY	---	---	+900	900
AIR NATIONAL GUARD				
MCGHEE-TYSON APT				
COMPOSITE SQ OPNS/TELECOMM FAC	2,715	2,715	---	2,715
FIRE STATION	1,000	1,000	---	1,000
JET FUEL STORAGE	1,035	1,035	---	1,035
MEMPHIS IAP				
FUEL SYS MAINT/CORROSION CONTROL DOCK	2,600	2,600	---	2,600
NASHVILLE MAP				
FUEL SYS MAINT/CORROSION CONTROL DOCK	2,650	2,650	---	2,650
TOTAL, TENNESSEE	37,765	37,565	+700	38,465
TEXAS				
ARMY				
FORT BLISS				
BATTALION CLASSROOM	530	530	---	530
COMPANY ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPLY	2,200	2,200	---	2,200
DINING FACILITY MODERNIZATION	4,350	4,350	---	4,350
MULTI-PURPOSE DIVAD RANGE	9,000	9,000	---	9,000
MULTI-PURPOSE TRAINING RANGE	17,500	17,500	---	17,500
REPLACE EXTERIOR LIGHTING	1,150	1,150	---	1,150
PHYSICAL FITNESS TRAINING CENTER	---	---	(+2,850)	(2,850)
INFANTRY REMOTE TARGET SYSTEMS RANGES	---	---	(+3,000)	(3,000)
FORT HOOD				
AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE FACILITY	11,400	11,400	---	11,400
AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE FACILITY	13,200	13,200	---	13,200
AUTOMATED TRACKED VEHICLE WASHING FACILITY	5,500	5,500	---	5,500
BRIGADE HEADQUARTERS	1,250	1,250	---	1,250
FIELD LIGHTING	700	700	---	700
MULTI-PURPOSE TRAINING RANGE	9,600	9,600	---	9,600
MULTI-PURPOSE TRAINING RANGE	2,800	2,800	---	2,800
MULTI-PURPOSE TRAINING RANGE	5,200	5,200	---	5,200
STORM WINDOWS AND WEATHERSTRIPPING	2,250	2,250	---	2,250
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	8,400	8,400	---	8,400
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	8,200	8,200	---	8,200
BRADLEY VEH RANGE	---	3,350	(+3,350)	(3,350)
BULK FUEL STORAGE	---	4,200	(+4,200)	(4,200)
RED RIVER ARMY DEPOT				
BRADLEY VEHICLE SUPPORT FACILITY	1,250	1,250	---	1,250
NAVY				
NAVAL AIR STATION CHASE FIELD				
CHILD CARE CENTER	550	550	---	550
CONTROL TOWER	580	580	---	580

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project (1)	DOD request (2)	House allowance (3)	SASC authorization compared to budget (4)	Committee recommendation (5)
ELEVATED PORTABLE WATER STORAGE TANK	1,030	1,030	---	1,030
FAMILY SERVICES CENTER	465	465	---	465
NAVAL AIR STATION CORPUS CHRISTI				
FAMILY SERVICES CENTER	495	495	---	495
NAVAL AIR STATION KINGSVILLE				
FAMILY SERVICES CENTER	560	560	---	560
RUNWAY IMPROVEMENTS	4,270	4,270	---	4,270
AIR FORCE				
BERGSTROM AFB				
ADD TO ENGINE INSP & REPAIR SHOP	640	640	---	640
ALTER MECHANICAL/ELECTRICAL	440	440	---	440
REGIONAL AIRCRAFT STRIPPING/PAINTING FAC	5,700	5,700	---	5,700
BASE SUPPORT CENTER	---	---	(+6,500)	(6,500)
COMPOSITE WING FACILITY	---	---	(+1,280)	(1,280)
EDUCATION CENTER	---	---	(+2,750)	(2,750)
ACCESS ROAD	---	---	(+3,000)	(3,000)
BROOKS AFB				
ADD TO/ALTER OCCUPATNL ENVIRON HEALTH LAB	5,260	5,260	---	5,260
ALTER BASE SUPPLY ADMINISTRATIVE FACILITY	1,550	1,550	---	1,550
ALTER MECHANICAL/ELECTRICAL/STRUCTURAL	410	410	---	410
CONSOLIDATED SUPPORT CENTER	2,660	2,660	---	2,660
OSH-FIRE PROTECTION SYS	230	230	---	230
CARSWELL AFB				
ALTER ELECT/MECH/STRUCT	400	400	---	400
JET FUEL STORAGE	3,000	3,000	---	3,000
UPGRADE POWER PLANTS ADMS	---	---	(+710)	(710)
DYESS AFB				
AIRCRAFT FUEL SYSTEM MAINTENANCE DOCK	2,900	2,900	---	2,900
ALTER UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED PERSONNEL HSG	5,500	5,500	---	5,500
COMBAT CREW TNG SQ(CCTS) SUPPORT FAC	1,900	1,900	---	1,900
MUNITIONS SUPPORT FAC	4,000	4,000	---	4,000
GOODFELLOW AFB				
OSH-FIRE PROTECTION SYS	320	320	---	320
PAVE PAWS-REAL ESTATE ACQUISITION	420	420	---	420
ALT ELEC DISTR SYS	---	1,500	(+1,600)	(1,600)
VOICE PROCESSING TRNG. FAC	---	---	(+7,800)	(7,800)
JOHNSON SPACE CENTER				
STS-SECURITY MODIFICATIONS	700	---	---	700
KELLY AFB				
ADD TO AIR FREIGHT TERMINAL	3,050	3,050	---	3,050
ADD TO ELECTRONIC SYS COMMAND HDQTRS FAC	7,000	7,000	---	7,000
ALTER DELUGE PUMP POWER SUPPLY	240	240	---	240
UPGRADE INDUSTRIAL WASTE TREATMENT	11,000	11,000	---	11,000
WEATHERIZE/ALTER MECHANICAL	1,300	1,300	---	1,300
LACKLAND AFB				
UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED PERSONNEL HOUSING	7,800	7,800	---	7,800
CHAPEL	---	---	(+2,900)	(2,900)
LAUGHLIN AFB				
LAND FEE PURCHASE	2,120	---	-2,120	---
REESE AFB				
AIRCRAFT MAINT ENGINE INSPECTN/REPAIR SHOP	1,550	1,550	---	1,550
SAN ANTONIO AREA				
UPGRADE REGIONAL CONNECTION	12,000	12,000	---	12,000

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project (1)	DOD request (2)	House allowance (3)	SASC authorization compared to budget (4)	Committee recommendation (5)
SHEPPARD AFB				
INSULATION	500	500	---	500
UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED PERSONNEL HOUSING	7,200	7,200	---	7,200
VISITING OFFICER QTRS	5,200	5,200	---	5,200
GYM	---	---	(+3,180)	(3,180)
DEFENSE AGENCIES				
DEF PROPERTY DISPOSAL OFF SAN ANTONIO				
HAZARDOUS MATERIAL DISPOSAL FACILITY	500	500	---	500
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD				
EAGLE PASS				
100 PERSON ARMORY	---	681	+681	681
SAN ANTONIO				
ARMORY ADDITION	1,115	1,115	---	1,115
AIR NATIONAL GUARD				
ELLINGTON				
FIRE SUPPRESSION/DETECTION	650	650	---	650
FUEL SYS MAINT/CORROSION CONTROL DOCK	1,360	1,360	---	1,360
REFUELING VEHICLE PARKING	250	250	---	250
ARMY RESERVE				
CORPUS CHRISTI				
600-MEMBER AFRC/ORS/AMSA	2,490	2,490	---	2,490
NAVY RESERVE				
ARMED FORCES RESERVE CENTER CORPUS CHRISTI				
RESERVE TRAINING BUILDING	3,350	3,350	---	3,350
NAS DALLAS				
UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED PERSONNEL HOUSING	4,400	4,400	---	4,400
AICUZ III	---	295	---	---
AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	---	250	---	---
CHAPEL	---	1,500	---	---
TOTAL, TEXAS	221,535	230,491	-1,439	220,096
UTAH				
ARMY				
FORT DOUGLAS				
MILITARY ENTRANCE PROCESSING STATION	910	910	---	910
AIR FORCE				
HILL AFB				
ADD TO DEPOT ACFT FUEL SYS MAINT DOCK	640	640	---	640
BASE SUPPLY AND EQUIPMENT WAREHOUSE	700	700	---	700
DEPOT AIRCRAFT WEAPONS MAINTENANCE SHOP	5,600	5,600	---	5,600
OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH CLINIC	2,950	2,950	---	2,950
REFUELING VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP	700	700	---	700
RELIGIOUS EDUC CENTER	1,600	800	---	1,600
SOUND SUPPESSOR SUPPORT	965	965	---	965
SQUADRON OPERATIONS FACILITY	3,000	3,000	---	3,000
DEFENSE AGENCIES				
DEF PROPERTY DISPOSAL OFFICE TOOELE				
ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING	420	420	---	420

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project (1)	DOD request (2)	House allowance (3)	SASC authorization compared to budget (4)	Committee recommendation (5)
AIR FORCE RESERVE				
HILL AFB				
ACFT GENERATION SHOP	470	470	---	470
ADD TO ROCKET CHECKOUT & ASSY FAC	260	260	---	260
ADD/ALT SQDN OPNS	400	400	---	400
TOTAL, UTAH	18,615	17,815	---	18,615
VERMONT				
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD				
ETHAN ALLEN				
UNIT ADMIN/SUPPLY BUILDING	260	260	---	260
ARMY RESERVE				
RUTLAND				
EXP TO ARMY RESERVE CEN-MAINT ACTIVITY	1,384	1,384	---	1,384
TOTAL, VERMONT	1,644	1,644	---	1,644
VIRGINIA				
ARMY				
FORT EUSTIS				
STEAM PLANT ADDITION	3,400	---	-3,400	---
FORT LEE				
ELECTRIC POWER GENERATING PLANT	630	630	---	630
FOOD SERVICE TRAINING FACILITY	5,300	5,300	---	5,300
FORT MYER				
INSULATE BUILDINGS	900	900	---	900
STEAM DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM EXTENSION	1,850	1,850	---	1,850
FORT STORY				
MAINTENANCE FACILITY	7,200	7,200	---	7,200
PHYSICAL FITNESS TRAINING CENTER	1,800	1,800	---	1,800
NAVY				
FLEET ANTI-SUB WARFARE TRAIN CTR NORFOLK				
APPLIED INSTRUCTION BUILDING	1,900	1,500	---	1,500
APPLIED INSTRUCTION BUILDING	2,230	2,230	---	2,230
FLEET COMBAT DIRECT SYS SUPT ACT DAM NECK				
COMBAT DATA SYSTEMS BUILDING ADDITION	4,000	4,000	---	4,000
FLEET COMBAT TRAIN CTR ATLANTIC DAM NECK				
GYMNASIUM ADDITION	1,390	1,390	---	1,390
UNACCOMP ENLISTED PERS HOUSING	10,800	10,800	---	10,800
APPLIED INSTR BLDG	---	12,200	---	---
FLEET TRAINING CENTER NORFOLK				
APPLIED INSTRUCTION BUILDING	1,120	1,120	---	1,120
MARINE CORPS CAMP DET NORFOLK CAMP ELMORE				
PHYSICAL FITNESS CENTER	1,160	1,160	---	1,160
MARINE CORPS DEV & EDUC COMMAND QUANTICO				
FIELD MAINTENENCE SHOP	2,570	2,570	---	2,570
NAVAL AIR REWORK FACILITY NORFOLK				
REPAIR SHOP IMP	3,020	3,020	---	3,020
NAVAL AIR STATION OCEANA				
AIRCRAFT PARKING APRON	3,480	3,480	8	3,480
FAMILY SERVICES CENTER	415	415	---	415

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	DOD request	House allowance	SASC authorization compared to budget	Committee recommendation
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
NAVAL AMPHIBIOUS BASE LITTLE CREEK				
ELECTRONICS/COMMUNICATIONS MAINT SHOP	1,070	1,070	---	1,070
ELECTRONICS/COMMUNICATIONS MAINT SHOP	3,160	3,160	---	3,160
PERSONNEL SUPPORT FACILITIES	1,830	1,830	---	1,830
VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY	3,110	3,110	---	3,110
NAVAL GUIDED MISSILES SCHOOL DAM NECK				
OPER TRAINER FAC (HS NORFOLK)	1,860	1,860	---	1,860
NAVAL SHIPYARD NORFOLK				
CHILD CARE CENTER	560	560	---	560
MUNICIPAL SEWER CONNECTION	8,290	8,290	---	8,290
STEAM PLANT (PHASE II)	118,000	110,000	---	118,000
ELEC DISTR SYS MOD	---	10,500	---	---
NAVAL STATION NORFOLK				
DREDGING	2,560	2,560	---	2,560
NAVAL SUPPLY CENTER NORFOLK				
DATA PROCESSING FACILITY	6,400	6,400	---	6,400
NAVAL SURFACE WEAPONS CENTER DAHLGREN				
APPLIED INSTRUCTION BUILDING	4,180	4,180	---	4,180
UNACCOMP ENLISTED PERS HOUSING ADDN	800	800	---	800
UNACCOMP OFFICER PERS HOUSING ADDN	375	375	---	375
NAVCAMS LANT NORFOLK				
FIRE PROTECTION (ANNAPOLIS)	600	600	---	600
SAT EARTH TERM (G BAY)	1,090	1,090	---	1,090
TACTICAL TRAIN GRP ATLANTIC VIRGINIA BEACH				
OPERATIONAL TRAINER FACILITY	3,750	---	---	3,750
AIR FORCE				
LANGLEY AFB				
BASE SUPPLY COMPLEX-PHASE I	5,000	5,000	---	5,000
OSH-FIRE SUPPRESSION SYS	3,300	3,300	---	3,300
DEFENSE AGENCIES				
CLASSIFIED ACTIVITY FORT BELVOIR				
COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT FACILITY	3,000	3,000	---	3,000
DEF PROPERTY DISPOSAL OFFICE NORFOLK				
HAZARDOUS MATERIAL DISPOSAL FACILITY	940	940	---	940
DEF SYS MGMT COL -FT BELVOIR				
ACADEMIC FACILITY	4,700	---	---	4,700
PENTAGON				
PENTAGON COMPUTER FACILITY EXPANSION	1,000	1,000	---	1,000
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD				
GATE CITY				
ARMORY ADDITION	484	484	---	484
FORT PICKETT				
DIRECT SUPPORT LOGISTICAL FACILITY	390	390	---	390
MOBILIZATION & TRAINING EQUIPMENT SITE	4,844	4,844	---	4,844
TOTAL, VIRGINIA	234,458	236,908	-3,400	230,658
WASHINGTON				
ARMY				
FORT LEWIS				
BARRACKS	1,740	1,740	---	1,740
BATTALION HEADQUARTERS AND CLASSROOM	1,450	1,450	---	1,450
BATTALION HEADQUARTERS AND CLASSROOM	2,800	2,800	---	2,800
BRIGADE HEADQUARTERS	1,500	1,500	---	1,500

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project (1)	DOD request (2)	House allowance (3)	SASC authorization compared to budget (4)	Committee recommendation (5)
COMPANY ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPLY	4,250	4,250	---	4,250
CORRECT SAFETY DEFICIENCIES	2,650	2,650	---	2,650
FLIGHT SIMULATOR BUILDING	8,000	8,000	---	8,000
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	7,800	7,800	---	7,800
TEMPERATURE CONTROLS AND LIGHTING	1,450	1,450	---	1,450
HANGAR ADDITION	---	---	(+2,800)	(2,800)
INSTRUMENT LANDING SYSTEM	---	---	(+870)	(870)
NAVY				
NAVAL AIR STATION WHIDBEY ISLAND				
HEATING PLANT ADDITION	3,160	3,160	---	3,160
NAVAL SUBMARINE BASE BANGOR				
DATA PROCESSING CENTER (TRIDENT REFIT FAC)	1,580	1,580	---	1,580
FAMILY SERVICES CENTER	1,180	1,180	---	1,180
UNACCOMP ENLISTED PERS HOUSING	5,280	5,280	---	5,280
NSC BREMERTN PUGET SND				
OIL SPILL PREVENTION	200	200	---	200
NSY PUGET SOUND				
UEPH	---	---	+7,300	7,300
NUSWES KEYPORT				
STATION ACCESS FAC	---	1,400	---	---
AIR FORCE				
FAIRCHILD AFB				
AIR LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE IGLOOS	2,100	2,100	---	2,100
AIRCRAFT ALERT APRON	3,050	3,050	---	3,050
ALTER MECHANICAL/STRUCT	570	570	---	570
ALTER UEPH	---	5,000	(+5,000)	(5,000)
REHAB PERSONNEL OFF	---	---	(+1,100)	(1,100)
UEPH	---	8,500	(+8,500)	(8,500)
DINING FAC	---	3,730	(+3,730)	(3,730)
HYDRANT FUELING SYSTEM	---	4,400	---	---
MCCHORD AFB				
EXTERIOR AREA LIGHTING	990	990	---	990
SOUND SUPPRESSOR SUPPORT	420	420	---	420
UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED PERSONNEL HOUSING	7,000	7,000	---	7,000
JAR MAINT/OPNS/TNG FACS	4,000	3,750	---	3,750
DEFENSE AGENCIES				
DEF PROPERTY DISPOSAL OFFICE FORT LEWIS				
HAZARDOUS MATERIAL DISPOSAL FACILITY	650	650	---	650
NAVY RESERVE				
NAVAL AIR RESERVE UNIT WHIDBEY ISLAND				
AIRCRAFT PARKING APRON	4,500	4,500	---	4,500
AIR FORCE RESERVE				
MCCHORD AFB				
RES FORCES AEROMED EVAC TRAINING FAC	1,630	1,630	---	1,630
TOTAL, WASHINGTON	67,950	90,730	+7,300	75,000
WEST VIRGINIA				
NAVY				
NSGD SUGAR GROVE				
COMMUNICATIONS CENTER	7,400	7,400	---	7,400

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project (1)	DOD request (2)	House allowance (3)	SASC authorization compared to budget (4)	Committee recommendation (5)
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD				
BECKLEY				
ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP	381	381	---	381
CAMP DAWSON				
SPECIAL FORCES TRAINING SITE BLDG	---	---	+695	695
ARMY RESERVE				
GRAFTON				
ARMY RESERVE CEN-MAINTENANCE SHOP	1,636	1,636	---	1,636
NAVAL RESERVE				
WHEELING				
NMCR CENTER	---	---	+2,900	2,900
TOTAL, WEST VIRGINIA	9,417	9,417	+3,595	13,012
WISCONSIN				
ARMY RESERVE				
APPLETON				
ADD TO ARMY RESERVE CEN-MAINTENANCE SHOP	1,115	1,115	---	1,115
TOTAL, WISCONSIN	1,115	1,115	---	1,115
CONUS CLASSIFIED				
AIR FORCE				
AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE SUPPORT FACS	14,800	14,800	---	14,800
TOTAL, CONUS CLASSIFIED	14,800	14,800	---	14,800
CONUS UNSPECIFIED				
AIR FORCE				
PEACEKEEPER ACCESS ROADS	11,000	---	-9,000	2,000
PEACEKEEPER OPNS/TRNG/MAINT FAC	379,000	---	-342,300	70,000
SUPPORT FACILITIES	24,000	24,000	---	24,000
OTH-B WEST LAND ACQUISITION	1,500	---	-1,000	500
AIR NATIONAL GUARD				
AIRCRAFT ARRESTING SYSTEM	2,000	2,000	---	2,000
POWER CHECK PAD WITH SUPPRESSOR	2,400	2,400	---	2,400
TOTAL, CONUS UNSPECIFIED	419,900	28,400	-352,300	100,900
CONUS VARIOUS				
ARMY				
ACCESS ROADS	500	---	-500	---
SPECIAL SUPPORT	1,300	1,300	---	1,300
TOTAL, CONUS VARIOUS	1,800	1,300	-500	1,300
ASCENSION ISLAND				
AIR FORCE				
ASCENSION				
UNACCOMPANIED OFFICER PERSONNEL HOUSING	4,010	---	---	4,010
TOTAL, ASCENSION ISLAND	4,010	---	---	4,010

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project (1)	DOD request (2)	House allowance (3)	SASC authorization compared to budget (4)	Committee recommendation (5)
AUSTRALIA				
NAVY				
NAVAL COMMUNICATION STATION HAROLD E HOLT				
AUTOMOTIVE VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP	1,630	1,630	---	1,630
ELECTRONICS MAINTENANCE SHOP	1,390	1,390	---	1,390
TOTAL, AUSTRALIA	3,020	3,020	---	3,020
BERMUDA				
NAVY				
NAVAL AIR STATION BERMUDA				
FAMILY SERVICES CENTER	810	810	---	810
NAVAL FACILITY BERMUDA				
SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS	1,110	1,110	---	1,110
TOTAL, BERMUDA	1,920	1,920	---	1,920
DENMARK				
AIR FORCE				
VARIOUS LOCATIONS - DENMARK				
MINIMUM ESSENTIAL FACILITIES	4,900	4,900	‡	---
TOTAL, DENMARK	4,900	4,900	---	---
DIEGO GARCIA				
NAVY				
NAVAL SUPPORT FACILITY DIEGO GARCIA				
DENTAL CLINIC	3,450	3,450	---	3,450
FACILITIES EXPANSION	9,710	9,710	---	9,710
TRANSMITTER BUILDING ADDITION	8,560	8,560	---	8,560
VARIOUS COMMUNITY FACILITIES	6,990	4,290	-2,000	4,990
WAREHOUSE	2,540	2,540	---	2,540
WATERFRONT OPS/POL OPS/WEAPONS COMPLEX	3,250	3,250	---	3,250
AIR FORCE				
DIEGO GARCIA				
SPACE TRACK OBSERVATION FAC (GEODSS)	14,100	14,100	---	14,100
TRACKING/MONITORING STATION-NAVSTAR GPS	2,800	2,800	---	2,800
UPGRADE RUNWAY	41,300	41,300	---	41,300
TOTAL, DIEGO GARCIA	92,700	90,000	-2,000	90,700
EGYPT				
ARMY				
RAS BANAS				
RAPID DEPLOYMENT FORCE FACILITIES	41,000	---	---	---
AIR FORCE				
RAS BANAS				
RAPID DEPLOYMENT FORCE SUPPORT FACILITIES	55,390	---	---	---
TOTAL, EGYPT	96,390	---	---	---

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	DOD request	House allowance	SASC authorization compared to budget	Committee recommendation
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
GERMANY				
ARMY				
ANSBACH				
AMMUNITION STORAGE	2,450	2,450	-2,450	---
CONSOLIDATE BOILER PLANTS	1,100	1,100	---	1,100
ASCHAFFENBURG				
AMMUNITION STORAGE	790	790	-790	---
AUGSBURG				
FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEMS	2,550	2,550	---	2,550
RENOVATE HOSPITAL	22,000	22,000	---	22,000
BADENHAUSEN				
BARRACKS	8,300	8,300	---	8,300
BATTALION HEADQUARTERS	1,800	1,800	---	1,800
DINING FACILITY	3,200	3,200	---	3,200
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	12,900	12,900	---	12,900
UTILITIES	6,800	6,800	---	6,800
BAD HERSFELD				
AMMUNITION STORAGE	1,750	---	-1,750	---
BAD TOELZ				
ATTIC INSULATION	920	920	---	920
BAMBERG				
FACILITIES MODERNIZATION	2,300	2,300	---	2,300
FINANCE/PERSONNEL CENTER	1,800	1,800	---	1,800
BAUMHOLDER				
FACILITIES MODERNIZATION	5,400	5,400	---	5,400
BINDLACH				
FACILITY ENGINEER SHOP	2,200	2,200	---	2,200
CAMP MAY				
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	500	500	---	500
DARMSTADT				
FACILITIES MODERNIZATION	5,700	5,700	---	5,700
MULTI-PURPOSE RECREATION FACILITY	1,150	1,150	---	1,150
PHYSICAL FITNESS TRAINING CENTER	1,300	1,300	---	1,300
ETTLINGEN				
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	2,550	2,550	---	2,550
EUROPE VARIOUS				
STORAGE BUNKER SECURITY	19,000	19,000	---	19,000
FEUCHT				
BARRACKS WITH DINING FACILITY	7,100	7,100	---	7,100
FINTHEN				
BARRACKS WITH DINING FACILITY	3,350	3,350	-980	2,370
FISCHBACH				
SKILL DEVELOPMENT CENTER	1,250	---	---	1,250
FRIEDBERG				
BARRACKS	2,350	2,350	---	2,350
BARRACKS	3,250	3,250	---	3,250
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	3,100	3,100	---	3,100
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	1,700	1,700	---	1,700
FUERTH				
HARDSTAND	340	340	---	340
FULDA				
AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE FACILITY ADDITION	1,200	1,200	---	1,200
AMMUNITION STORAGE	1,650	---	-1,650	---

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project (1)	DOD request (2)	House allowance (3)	SASC authorization compared to budget (4)	Committee recommendation (5)
FACILITIES MODERNIZATION	8,700	8,700	---	8,700
PHYSICAL FITNESS TRAINING CENTER	2,250	2,250	---	2,250
GARMISCH				
ATTIC INSULATION	590	590	---	590
GELNHAUSEN				
CONSOLIDATE HEATING PLANTS	970	970	---	970
FACILITIES MODERNIZATION	10,900	10,900	---	10,900
GIERELSTADT				
AMMUNITION STORAGE	440	440	-440	---
BARRACKS	9,300	9,300	---	9,300
DINING FACILITY	3,000	3,000	---	3,000
HEATING AND UTILITIES	2,450	2,450	---	2,450
PHYSICAL FITNESS TRAINING CENTER	1,550	1,550	---	1,550
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	660	660	---	660
GOENPPINGEN				
BARRACKS	3,100	3,100	---	3,100
PHYSICAL FITNESS TRAINING CENTER	2,650	2,650	---	2,650
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	1,600	1,600	---	1,600
GRAFENWOEHR				
FIGHTING VEHICLE RANGE MODERNIZATION	15,000	15,000	---	15,000
GROSSAUHEIM				
FACILITIES MODERNIZATION	9,100	9,100	---	9,100
HANAU				
PARKING AREA	4,800	2,000	-2,400	2,400
HEIDELBERG				
PHYSICAL FITNESS TRAINING CENTER	2,550	2,550	---	2,550
HEILBRONN				
BARRACKS MODERNIZATION	930	---	-930	---
BATTALION HEADQUARTERS	1,550	---	-1,550	---
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	1,700	---	-1,700	---
KAISERSLAUTERN				
INTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS BUILDING	380	380	---	380
KARLSRUHE				
FACILITIES MODERNIZATION	4,500	4,500	---	4,500
KIRCHGOENS				
AUTO SELF HELP GARAGE	1,050	---	---	---
AUTOMATIC TEMPERATURE CONTROLS	760	760	---	760
SKILL DEVELOPMENT CENTER	910	---	---	910
KITZINGEN				
AMMUNITION STORAGE	2,550	2,550	---	2,550
AMMUNITION STORAGE	560	560	-560	---
BARRACKS	6,800	6,800	---	6,800
PHYSICAL FITNESS TRAINING CENTER ADDITION	760	760	---	760
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	2,150	2,150	---	2,150
KOEPPERN				
AMMUNITION MAINTENANCE FACILITY	9,700	9,700	---	9,700
KRIEGSFELD				
ADMINISTRATION BUILDING	750	750	---	750
AMMUNITION SURVEILLANCE FACILITY	3,350	3,350	---	3,350
PHYSICAL FITNESS TRAINING CENTER ADDITION	410	410	---	410
MAINZ				
AMMUNITION STORAGE	990	990	-990	---
BARRACKS MODERNIZATION	6,600	6,600	---	6,600
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	13,800	13,800	---	13,800

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	DOD request	House allowance	SASC authorization compared to budget	Committee recommendation
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
MANNHEIM				
FACILITIES MODERNIZATION	7,000	7,000	---	7,000
MUENSTER DEPOT				
AMMUNITION STORAGE	670	670	-670	---
MUTLANGEN				
HARDSTAND	410	410	---	410
NUERNBERG				
AUTOMATIC TEMPERATURE CONTROLS	380	---	-380	---
RHEINBERG				
PURCHASE OF SUPPORT FACILITIES	16,500	---	-16,500	---
RIVERS BARRACKS				
FACILITIES MODERNIZATION	4,550	4,550	---	4,550
SCHWABACH				
AMMUNITION STORAGE	960	960	-960	---
DINING FACILITY	4,350	4,350	---	4,350
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	11,800	11,800	---	11,800
SCHWEBISCH GMUEND				
FACILITIES MODERNIZATION	4,400	4,400	---	4,400
SCHWEINFURT				
AMMUNITION STORAGE	1,000	1,000	-1,000	---
PHYSICAL FITNESS TRAINING CENTER	2,450	2,450	---	2,450
SEVENTH ARMY TRAINING COMMAND				
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	500	500	---	500
STUTTGART				
CONSOLIDATE HEATING SYSTEMS	1,850	1,850	---	1,850
CONSOLIDATE HEATING SYSTEMS	1,750	1,750	---	1,750
HEAT RECOVERY SYSTEM	630	---	-630	---
WERTHEIN				
BATTALION HEADQUARTERS AND CLASSROOM	1,750	1,750	---	1,750
WIELERBACH				
AMMUNITION MAINTENANCE FACILITY	6,800	6,800	---	6,800
WILDFLECKEN				
FIGHTING VEHICLE RANGE MODERNIZATION	2,450	2,450	---	2,450
WUERZBURG				
DENTAL CLINIC	2,000	---	-2,000	---
ZWEIBRUCKEN				
ALTER ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDINGS	490	490	---	490
AIR FORCE				
BITBURG AB				
ADD TO WATER PLANT	810	810	---	810
CENTRAL HEATING PLANT	4,950	4,950	---	4,950
MODIFY TAB VEE SHELTERS	800	---	---	800
SECOND ECHELON MEDICAL LOGISTICS STORAGE	1,400	1,400	---	1,400
SECURITY LIGHTING/FLIGHTLINE RDS	720	720	---	720
WAREHOUSE	660	660	---	660
WATER STORAGE TANK	650	650	---	650
GEILENKIRCHEN AB				
DENTAL CLINIC	1,450	1,450	---	1,450
HAHN AB				
BASE SUPPLY AND EQUIPMENT WAREHOUSE	2,800	2,800	---	2,800
SECOND ECHELON MEDICAL LOGISTICS STORAGE	1,250	1,250	---	1,250
RAMSTEIN AB				
ADD TO ACCOUNTING & FINANCE FAC	1,450	---	---	1,450
ADD TO CORROSION CONTROL FAC	1,600	1,600	---	1,600

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	DOD request	House allowance	SASC authorization compared to budget	Committee recommendation
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
ADD TO/ALTER PRECISION MEASUREMENT EQ LAB	370	370	---	370
ALTER UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED PERSONNEL HSG	2,000	2,000	---	2,000
BASE ENGINEER STORAGE FAC	270	270	---	270
CONVERT AVIONICS SHOP TO FLIGHT TNG DETACH	410	---	---	410
MODIFY AIRCRAFT SHELTERS	660	660	---	660
PASSENGER TERMINAL/HQ FACILITY	6,300	---	---	6,300
SATELLITE COMMUNICATION GROUND TERMINAL	700	700	---	700
WAREHOUSE	4,150	---	---	4,150
RHEIN-MAIN AB				
CHEMICAL WARFARE SHELTER SUPPORT	300	---	---	300
SECOND ECHELON MEDICAL/LOG STORAGE FAC	700	700	---	700
SMALL ARMS TRAINING FACILITY	870	870	---	870
SEMBACH AB				
AIRCRAFT CORROSION CONTROL FACILITY	1,350	1,350	---	1,350
AREA SECURITY LIGHTING	360	360	---	360
SECOND ECHELON MEDICAL LOGISTICS STORAGE	800	800	---	800
WAREHOUSE	3,300	3,300	---	3,300
SPANGDAHLEM AB				
ACCESS ROADS & UTILITIES	2,950	---	-2,950	---
VARIOUS LOCATIONS-GERMANY				
COMMUNICATION SITE SURVIVABILITY	4,000	4,000	---	4,000
MINIMUM ESSENTIAL FACILITIES	18,000	11,600	*	---
PAVE TIGER-II	3,000	3,000	---	3,000
ZWEIBRUCKEN AB				
AVIONICS FAC-CHEMICAL WARFARE PROTECTION	1,464	---	---	1,464
EUROPEAN DIST SYS-FORWARD STORAGE WARFHSE	1,820	---	---	1,820
EUROPEAN DIST SYS-UNACCOMP ENL PERS HSG	2,700	---	---	2,700
EUROPEAN DISTRIBUTION SYS-OPNS/MAINT FAC	760	---	---	760
DEFENSE AGENCIES				
ANSBACH				
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	6,330	4,800	---	6,330
BAUMHOLDER				
ELEMENTAY SCHOOL ADDITION	1,850	1,200	---	1,850
DARMSTADT				
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	8,030	6,000	---	8,030
DEF PROPERTY DISPOSAL OFFICE HANAU				
COVERED AND OPEN STORAGE	1,300	1,300	---	1,300
GIESSEN				
HIGH SCHOOL	6,040	6,040	---	6,040
SPANGDALEN AIR BASE				
ELEMENTARY/HIGH SCHOOL	7,720	6,350	---	7,720
WILDFLECKEN				
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	6,240	5,200	---	6,240
TOTAL, GERMANY	457,534	388,310	-41,280	397,204
GREECE				
ARMY				
GREECE				
MULTI-PURPOSE BUILDING	620	620	-620	---
MULTI-PURPOSE RECREATION FACILITY	480	480	-480	---
OPERATIONS BUILDING	370	370	-370	---
OPERATIONS BUILDING	410	410	-410	---
PHYSICAL FITNESS TRAINING CENTER	1,000	1,000	-1,000	---

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project (1)	DOD request (2)	House allowance (3)	SASC authorization compared to budget (4)	Committee recommendation (5)
UNACCOMPANIED OFFICER HOUSING	600	600	-600	---
UNACCOMPANIED PERSONNEL HOUSING	1,400	1,400	-1,400	---
NAVY				
NCS NEA NAKRI				
RECEIVER BUILDING	4,930	---	-4,930	---
TOTAL, GREECE	9,810	4,880	-9,810	---
GREENLAND				
AIR FORCE				
VARIOUS LOCATIONS - GREENLAND				
DEWLINE FAC	20,530	---	-20,530	---
TOTAL, GREENLAND	20,530	---	-20,530	---
GUAM				
NAVY				
NAVCAMS WESTPAC GUAM				
TELEMETRY BUILDING ADDITION	980	980	---	980
NH GUAM				
AMMUNITION WHARF	22,300	22,300		22,300
AIR FORCE				
ANDERSON AFB				
ALTER UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED PERSONNEL HSG	8,100	8,100	---	8,100
ARTS & CRAFTS SHOP	1,500	---	-1,500	---
UPGRADE POWER PLT	610	610	---	610
AIR NATIONAL GUARD				
ANDERSON AFB				
BASE ENGINEER MAINT FAC	1,960	1,960	---	1,960
TOTAL, GUAM	35,450	33,950	-1,500	33,950
GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA				
NAVY				
NAVAL STATION GUANTANAMO				
FAMILY SERVICES CENTER	730	730	---	730
NSGB GUANTANAMO				
RECEIVER BLDG ADDITION	1,700	1,700	---	1,700
TOTAL, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA	2,430	2,430	---	2,430
HONDURAS				
AIR FORCE				
LA CEIBA				
CONTINGENCY AIRFIELD IMPROVEMENTS	8,000	---	---	8,000
TOTAL, HONDURAS	8,000	---	---	8,000
ICELAND				
NAVY				
NS KEFLAVIK				
AVIONICS SHOP	2,040	2,040	---	2,040
COMBINED OPERATIONS CENTER	4,650	---	-4,650	---
FUELING PIER	44,400	---	-44,400	---

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project (1)	DOD request (2)	House allowance (3)	SASC authorization compared to budget (4)	Committee recommendation (5)
GENERAL WAREHOUSE	4,180	---	-4,180	---
GSE FACILITY	1,040	1,040	---	1,040
MAINT SHOP ADDN	1,720	1,720	---	1,720
UTILITY IMPROVEMENTS	2,050	2,050	---	2,050
TOTAL, ICELAND	60,080	6,850	-53,230	6,850
ITALY				
ARMY				
CP DARBY				
CARE AND PRESERVATION BUILDING	2,350	---	---	2,350
WAREHOUSE DEHUMIDIFICATION	360	360	---	360
NAVY				
NAS SIGONELLA				
AFRTS STATION	1,350	1,200	-1,350	---
AIR CARGO TERM EXPAND	1,440	1,440	---	1,440
AVIONICS SHOP	7,250	7,250	---	7,250
CHILD CARE CENTER	1,250	1,250	---	1,250
FLT MAIL CTR	1,530	1,530	---	1,530
GYMNASIUM ADDN AND THEATER	2,420	2,000	-2,420	---
PASS OFFICE	1,070	900	---	900
PUBLIC WORKS FACILITIES	980	980	---	980
UTILITIES IMPROVEMENTS	6,090	2,960	---	6,090
NSA NAPLES				
CALIBRATION LAB	2,420	2,420	---	2,420
UNACCOMP ENLISTED PERS HOUSING & SUPT FACS	2,280	2,280	---	2,280
PERSUPPACT NAPLES				
PASS OFFICE	640	640	---	640
AIR FORCE				
AVIANO AB				
AIR PHOTO FAC-CHEMICAL WARFARE PROTECTION	900	---	---	900
BASE SUPPLY WAREHOUSE	3,000	3,000	---	3,000
CENTRAL HEAT/ALTER STRUCTURAL	880	880	---	880
CLINIC	6,310	6,310	---	6,310
CAMP DARBY				
MUNITIONS SUPERVISION FAC	400	400	---	400
CONISO				
GLCM FACS	26,900	14,900	-9,150	14,900
SAN VITO AS				
AIR FREIGHT TERMINAL	530	530	---	530
WAREHOUSE	660	660	---	660
VARIOUS LOCATIONS-ITALY				
MINIMUM ESSENTIAL FACILITIES	8,300	---	[illegible]	---
DEFENSE AGENCIES				
CONISO				
ELEMENTARY/HIGH SCHOOL	12,990	---	---	---
VICENZA				
ELEMENTARY/HIGH SCHOOL ADDITION	2,310	2,310	---	2,310
TOTAL, ITALY	94,610	54,200	-12,920	57,380

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project (1)	DOD request (2)	House allowance (3)	SASC authorization compared to budget (4)	Committee recommendation (5)
JAPAN				
ARMY				
OKINAWA VARIOUS				
PETROLEUM TANK RELOCATION	1,400	1,400	---	1,400
NAVY				
FLEACTS OKINAWA				
FAMILY SERVICE CENTER	680	---	-630	---
MCAS IWAKUNI				
AIRCRAFT RINSE FAC	750	750	---	750
AIR FORCE				
KADENA AB				
ALTER MECHANICAL	860	760	---	760
CENTRAL INTERMEDIATE REPAIR FAC-SUP WHSE	3,200	3,200	---	3,200
JET FUEL STORAGE (JP-7)	5,600	5,600	---	5,600
SQUADRON FLIGHT OPERATIONS FACILITY	1,700	1,700	---	1,700
MISAWA AB				
ALTER MECH/STRUCT	1,900	1,700	---	1,700
COMMANDO PORT SUPPORT-PHASE I	29,900	17,000	-29,900	---
YOKOTA AB				
INSULATION AND UPGRADE LIGHTING	300	300	---	300
PETROLEUM OPERATIONS FACILITY	950	950	---	950
TOTAL, JAPAN	47,240	33,360	-30,580	16,360
JOHNSTON ISLAND				
DEFENSE AGENCIES				
DNA HDQTRS FIELD COMMAND				
RENOVATE AND UPGRADE BLDGS	600	600	---	600
TOTAL, JOHNSTON ISLAND	600	600	---	600
KOREA				
ARMY				
CAMP CARROLL				
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	1,300	1,300	---	1,300
CAMP COLBERN				
COMMUNICATIONS MAINTENANCE FACILITY	200	200	---	200
COMPANY ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPLY	470	470	---	470
UNACCOMPANIED PERSONNEL HOUSING	2,500	2,500	---	2,500
CAMP EDWARDS				
GENERAL PURPOSE AUDITORIUM	500	500	---	500
CAMP ESSAYONS				
COMPANY ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPLY	450	450	---	450
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	1,000	1,000	---	1,000
CAMP HOWZE				
PHYSICAL FITNESS TRAINING CENTER	1,950	1,950	---	1,950
CAMP HUMPHREYS				
AIRCRAFT SHELTERS	5,000	5,000	---	5,000
CHAPEL WITH COMMUNITY ACTIVITY CENTER	1,200	1,200	---	1,200
TECHNICAL SUPPORT FACILITY	1,650	1,650	---	1,650
CAMP KITTYHAWK				
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	610	610	---	610

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	DOD request	House allowance	SASC authorization compared to budget	Committee recommendation
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
CAMP RED CLOUD				
BARRACKS	1,200	1,200	---	1,200
GENERAL PURPOSE AUDITORIUM	690	690	---	690
PHYSICAL FITNESS TRAINING CENTER ADDITION	360	360	---	360
SECURITY LIGHTING	400	400	---	400
SKILL DEVELOPMENT CENTER	430	---	---	430
WAREHOUSE	750	750	---	750
K-16 ARMY AIRFIELD				
BARRACKS WITH DINING FACILITY	3,650	3,650	---	3,650
PHYSICAL FITNESS TRAINING CENTER WITH POOL	1,550	1,550	---	1,550
KOREA VARIOUS				
AIR CONDITION LIBRARY	620	620	---	620
COMMUNICATIONS CENTER	2,200	---	---	2,200
OPERATIONS BUILDING	150	---	-150	---
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	4,750	4,750	---	4,750
UNACCOMPANIED PERSONNEL HOUSING	19,500	19,500	---	19,500
LOCATION 1/				
PERIMETER FENCE	260	260	---	260
SEOUL				
STORAGE FACILITY	630	630	---	630
TACTICAL EQUIPMENT SHOP	890	890	---	890
VEHICLE PARTS SUPPLY FACILITY	1,100	1,100	---	1,100
TAEGU				
MATERIAL MANAGEMENT CENTER	3,600	3,600	---	3,600
YONGSAN				
BOILER MODIFICATIONS	430	430	---	430
NAVY				
COMNAVFORKOREA DET CHINHAE				
CHAPEL	460	460	---	460
AIR FORCE				
KUNSAN AB				
ALTER MECHANICAL/ELECTRICAL/STRUCTURAL	440	393	---	393
FIRE STATION/WEATHER OBSERVATION FAC	3,000	3,000	---	3,000
SECOND ECHELON MEDICAL LOGISTICS STORAGE	600	600	---	600
UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED PERSONNEL HOUSING	18,200	18,200	---	18,200
UNACCOMPANIED OFFICER PERSONNEL HOUSING	8,100	8,100	---	8,100
WEAPONS MAINTENANCE FACILITY	720	720	---	720
KWANG-JU AB				
SECOND ECHELON MEDICAL LOGISTICS STORAGE	210	210	---	210
OSAN AB				
ADD TO/ALTER GYMNASIUM	1,550	1,550	---	1,550
AIRCRAFT SHELTERS	9,100	9,100	---	9,100
ALTER MECHANICAL/ELECTRICAL/STRUCTURAL	1,590	1,390	---	1,390
OSH-FIRE PROTECTION SYS	610	610	---	610
PUBLICATIONS MANAGEMENT CENTER	710	---	---	710
SECOND ECHELON MEDICAL LOGISTICS STORAGE	770	770	---	770
SOUND SUPPRESSOR SUPPORT	620	620	---	620
SUPPLY/EQUIPMENT WAREHOUSE	3,800	3,800	---	3,800
UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED PERSONNEL HOUSING	11,200	11,200	---	11,200
UNACCOMPANIED OFFICER PERSONNEL HOUSING	5,300	5,300	---	5,300
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE	7,100	7,100	---	7,100
SAECHON AB				
SECOND ECHELON MEDICAL LOGISTICS STORAGE	210	210	---	210

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project (1)	DOD request (2)	House allowance (3)	SASC authorization compared to budget (4)	Committee recommendation (5)
SUNON				
SECOND ECHELON MEDICAL LOGISTICS STORAGE	400	400	---	400
TAEGU AB				
SECOND ECHELON MEDICAL LOGISTICS STORAGE	210	210	---	210
SECURITY POLICE OPNS FAC	490	490	---	490
UNDERGROUND FUEL STORAGE	2,050	2,050	---	2,050
VARIOUS LOCATIONS - KOREA				
CHEMICAL WARFARE PROTECTION FAC	5,900	---	---	5,900
TOTAL, KOREA	143,330	133,693	-150	142,933
KWAJALEIN				
ARMY				
KWAJALEIN				
EXPLOSIVE STORAGE FACILITY	710	710	---	710
MISSILE ASSEMBLY FACILITY	830	830	---	830
MULTI-PURPOSE RECREATION FACILITY	3,550	1,500	---	3,550
WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY	530	530	---	530
TOTAL, KWAJALEIN	5,620	3,570	---	5,620
MOROCCO				
AIR FORCE				
VARIOUS PETRO/OIL/LUB SUPPORT FACILITIES	28,000	25,000	---	25,000
OMAN				
AIR FORCE				
VARIOUS LOCATIONS - OMAN				
RAPID DEPLOYMENT FORCE FACILITIES	39,600	28,600	-11,000	28,600
TOTAL, OMAN	39,600	28,600	-11,000	28,600
NETHERLANDS				
AIR FORCE				
CP NEW AMSTERDAM				
BASE ADMINISTRATION FACILITY	2,050	---	---	2,050
TOTAL, NETHERLANDS	2,050	---	---	2,050
NORWAY				
AIR FORCE				
VARIOUS LOCATIONS - NORWAY				
MINIMUM ESSENTIAL FACILITIES	1,500	1,500	8	---
TOTAL, NORWAY	1,500	1,500	---	---
PANAMA				
ARMY				
COROZAL				
DINING FACILITY MODERNIZATION	700	700	---	700
ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	760	760	---	760

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[in thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	DOD request	House allowance	SASC authorization compared to budget	Committee recommendation
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
NAVY				
NS PANAMA				
UNACCOMP ENLISTED PERS HOUSING	1,490	1,490	-1,490	---
AIR FORCE				
HOWARD AFB				
RADIO CONTROL SYSTEM-ALTER MECHANICAL	690	613	---	613
TOTAL, PANAMA	3,640	3,563	-1,490	2,073
PHILIPPINES				
NAVY				
NS SUBIC BAY				
FAMILY SERVICES CENTER	880	---	---	880
PASS OFFICE	840	---	---	840
UNACCOMP ENLISTED PERS HOUSING MODN	6,140	---	---	6,140
AIR FORCE				
CLARK AB				
ADD TO SATELLITE COMMUNICATION RECVR FAC	4,250	---	---	4,250
ALTER ELECT/MECH	990	---	---	990
ALTER UNACCOMPANIED OFFICER PERSONNEL HSG	1,450	---	---	1,450
CONSOLIDATED SUPPORT FACILITY	2,250	---	---	2,250
DEFENSE AGENCIES				
BINICTICAN SUBIC BAY				
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ADDITION	1,360	---	---	1,360
CLARK AFB				
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ADDITION	8,020	---	---	8,020
DEWEY SUBIC BAY				
HIGH SCHOOL ADDITION	1,680	---	---	1,680
KALAYAAN SUBIC BAY				
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ADDITION	1,650	---	---	1,650
TOTAL, PHILIPPINES	29,510	---	---	29,510
PORTUGAL				
AIR FORCE				
LAJES FIELD				
ALTER UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED PERSONNEL HSG	1,400	1,400	---	1,400
DEFENSE AGENCIES				
LAJES AIR BASE				
ELEMENTARY/HIGH SCHOOL ADDITION	4,590	4,590	---	4,590
TOTAL, PORTUGAL	5,990	5,990	---	5,990
PUERTO RICO				
ARMY				
FORT BUCHANAN				
ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	1,550	1,550	---	1,550
NAVY				
NS ROOSEVELT RDS				
FAMILY SERVICES CENTER	1,300	1,300	---	1,300
UPNTRFAC ROOSEVELT RDS				
LAND ACQUISITION	415	---	---	415
RANGE OPERATION CTR ADDN	1,530	---	---	1,530

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	DOD request	House allowance	SASC authorization compared to budget	Committee recommendation
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD				
FORT BUCHANAN				
US PROPERTY & FISCAL OFFICER	784	784	---	784
TOTAL, PUERTO RICO	5,579	3,634	---	5,579
SCOTLAND				
AIR FORCE				
PRESTWICK AIRFIELD				
EUROPEAN DIST SYS-FORWARD STORAGE WAREHSE	1,820	---	-1,820	---
TOTAL, SCOTLAND	1,820	---	-1,820	---
SPAIN				
NAVY				
NAVOCEANCOMCTR ROTA				
METEROLOGICAL BLDG ADDN	980	980	---	980
NS ROTA				
PASS OFFICE	980	980	---	980
UNACCOMP ENLISTED PERS HOUSING	8,270	8,270	---	8,270
AIR FORCE				
TORREJON AB				
ALTER CENTRAL HEAT PLANT	1,872	1,872	---	1,872
ALTER UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED PERSONNEL HSG	4,000	4,000	---	4,000
EUROPEAN DIST SYS-FORWARD STORAGE WAREHSE	1,400	---	-1,400	---
HIGH EFFICIENCY LIGHTING	430	430	---	430
ZARAGOZA AB				
SOUND SUPPRESSOR SUPPORT	530	530	---	530
DEFENSE AGENCIES				
ZARAGOZA AFB				
HIGH SCHOOL ADDITION	680	680	---	680
TOTAL, SPAIN	19,142	17,742	-1,400	17,742
TURKEY				
ARMY				
TURKEY				
BARRACKS MODERNIZATION	3,350	3,350	---	3,350
HEALTH CLINIC	1,300	1,300	---	1,300
MULTI-PURPOSE RECREATION BUILDING	300	300	---	300
MULTI-PURPOSE RECREATION BUILDING	300	300	---	300
AIR FORCE				
ANKARA				
ALTER MECHANICAL SYSTEM	210	210	---	210
HOUSING SUPPLY WAREHOUSE	1,100	1,100	---	1,100
INCIRLIK AB				
BASE CIVIL ENGINEER COMPLEX	1,300	1,300	---	1,300
SECURITY POLICE OPNS FAC	1,450	1,450	---	1,450
SQUADRON OPNS ADDITIONS-CHEM WARFARE PROT	1,100	---	---	1,100
TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT FACILITY	1,050	1,050	---	1,050
IZMIR				
WEATHERIZATION/ALT ELEC/SOLAR COLLECTORS	310	310	---	310

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project (1)	DOD request (2)	House allowance (3)	SASC authorization compared to budget (4)	Committee recommendation (5)
VARIOUS LOCATIONS-TURKEY				
AIR BASE UPGRADE	66,700	---	---	66,700
DEFENSE AGENCIES				
INCIRLIK AIR BASE				
ELEMENTARY/HIGH SCHOOL ADDITION	7,170	5,800	---	7,170
TOTAL, TURKEY	85,640	16,470	---	85,640
UNITED KINGDOM				
NAVY				
NAVAL SUPPORT ACTIVITY HOLY LOCH				
FAMILY SERVICES CENTER	600	540	-600	---
GENERAL WAREHOUSE	3,120	2,800	-3,120	---
MEDICAL/DENTAL CLINIC	2,830	2,550	-2,830	---
SUPPLY PIER	3,260	2,950	-3,260	---
AIR FORCE				
MILDENHALL AB				
ALTER VISITING AIRMAN QUARTERS	2,350	2,291	---	2,350
ELECTRICAL AIRCRAFT OUTLETS	600	585	---	600
INSTALL MECHANICAL CONTROLS	220	215	---	220
SATELLITE COMMUNICATION GROUND TERMINAL	640	624	---	640
VISITING OFFICER QTRS	3,100	1,500	---	3,100
RAF ALCONBURY				
ALTER MECH/STRUCT	1,470	1,433	---	1,470
RAF BENTWATERS				
ALTER/NEW UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED PERS HSG	3,950	3,851	---	3,950
GYMNASIUM	3,300	3,218	---	3,300
WAREHOUSE	330	322	---	330
WEATHERIZE/ALTER ELECTRICAL	365	356	---	365
RAF CHICKSANDS				
ADD TO/ALTER OPERATIONS FACILITY	6,550	6,387	---	6,550
RAF CROUGHTON				
ADD TO/ALTER SATELLITE COMM GROUND TERMINL	2,200	2,145	---	2,200
COMM SITE SURVIVABILITY	1,700	1,658	---	1,700
RAF FAIRFORD				
BASE OPERATIONS FACILITY	2,000	1,950	---	2,000
UPGRADE BASE WATER SYS	1,800	1,755	---	1,800
RAF GREENHAM COMMON				
GLCM FACS	21,900	10,400	-11,555	10,400
RAF UPPER HEYFORD				
ALTER UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED PERSONNEL HSG	2,350	2,291	---	2,350
ALTER VISITING OFFICER QUARTERS	650	634	---	650
RAF WOODBRIDGE				
UNACCOMPANIED ENLISTED PERSONNEL HOUSING	2,660	2,594	---	2,660
VARIOUS LOCATIONS-UNITED KINGDOM				
MINIMUM ESSENTIAL FACILITIES	11,400	---	[illegible]	---
DEFENSE AGENCIES				
RAF GREENHAM COMMON				
ELEMENTARY/HIGH SCHOOL	12,770	---	---	---

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	DOD request	House allowance	SASC authorization compared to budget	Committee recommendation
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
RAF LAKENHEATH				
HIGH SCHOOL ADDITION	1,240	1,120	---	1,240
RAF WETHERSFIELD				
ELEMENTARY/HIGH SCHOOL ADDITION	3,120	2,832	---	3,120
TOTAL, UNITED KINGDOM	96,475	57,001	-21,365	50,995
VIRGIN ISLANDS				
AIR NATIONAL GUARD				
COMM/ELECTRONICS TRNG FAC	1,400	1,400	---	1,400
TOTAL, VIRGIN ISLANDS	1,400	1,400	---	1,400
OVERSEAS CLASSIFIED				
NAVY				
TELECOMMUNICATIONS CENTER	1,280	1,280	---	1,280
AIR FORCE				
OFFENSIVE AVIONICS SUPPORT FACILITY-SRAM	16,000	16,000	---	16,000
GLCM - FIFTH COUNTRY				
GLCM FACS	34,015	---	-34,015	---
GLCM-FOURTH COUNTRY				
GLCM FACS	22,300	22,220	-3,840	18,460
GLCM-THIRD COUNTRY				
GLCM FACS	42,750	30,750	-6,530	30,750
DEFENSE AGENCIES				
CLASSIFIED PROJECT	21,550	21,550	---	21,550
CLASSIFIED PROJECT	25,200	25,200	---	25,200
COMPUTER FACILITY EXPANSION	10,000	10,000	---	10,000
KINDERGARTEN THROUGH TWELFTH SCHOOL	9,690	---	---	---
TOTAL, OVERSEAS CLASSIFIED	182,785	127,000	-44,385	123,240
NATO				
NATO INFRASTRUCTURE	150,000	100,000	---	50,000
FINANCING	(150,000)	(150,000)	---	(150,000)
WORLDWIDE VARIOUS				
NAVY				
HOST NATION INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT	2,970	---	---	2,970
WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED				
ARMY				
MINOR CONSTRUCTION - UNSPECIFIED	32,000	27,385	-4,600	32,000
MOBILIZATION PLANNING & DESIGN	13,000	3,500	---	13,000
PLANNING AND DESIGN	175,000	165,000	---	175,000
GENERAL REDUCTION	---	-47,850	-50,600	-38,950
GENERAL REDUCTION, MINOR CONSTR. SPECIFIED	---	---	-6,800	---
GEOGRAPHIC REDUCTION	---	-9,000	---	---
NAVY				
ACCESS ROADS	900	900	---	900
NCON DESIGN FUNDS	115,600	115,600	---	115,600
UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	22,000	20,000	---	22,000

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project (1)	DOD request (2)	House allowance (3)	SASC authorization compared to budget (4)	Committee recommendation (5)
GENERAL REDUCTION	---	-97,719	-33,400	-19,145
GEOGRAPHIC REDUCTION	---	-13,000	---	---
AIR FORCE				
EMERGENCY MINOR CONSTRUCTION	19,000	17,000	---	19,000
MINOR LAND	200	200	---	200
PLANNING & DESIGN	186,000	127,000	-39,000	147,000
GENERAL REDUCTION	---	-152,160	-65,200	-98,000
GEOGRAPHIC REDUCTION	---	-8,000	---	---
EMERGY CONSERVATION, GENERAL REDUCTION	---	---	-1,096	---
GENERAL REDUCTION, MINOR CONSTR. SPECIFIED	---	---	-7,000	---
DEFENSE AGENCIES				
EMERGENCY CONSTRUCTION	30,000	10,000	-14,000	---
EXIGENT MINOR CONSTRUCTION	4,000	2,000	---	4,000
PLANNING AND DESIGN	33,000	23,000	---	33,000
GENERAL REDUCTION	---	---	-41,108	---
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD				
EXIGENT MINOR CONSTRUCTION	7,600	7,600	---	7,600
PLANNING AND DESIGN	3,200	3,200	---	3,200
GENERAL REDUCTION	---	---	---	-972
AIR NATIONAL GUARD				
MINOR CONSTRUCTION	5,500	5,500	---	5,500
PLANNING & DESIGN	8,600	8,600	---	8,600
GENERAL REDUCTION	---	---	---	-732
ARMY RESERVE				
EXIGENT MINOR CONSTRUCTION	4,600	4,600	---	4,600
PLANNING AND DESIGN	7,900	7,900	---	7,900
GENERAL REDUCTION	---	---	---	-1,000
NAVY RESERVE				
EXIGENT MINOR CONSTRUCTION	1,000	1,000	---	1,000
PLANNING AND DESIGN	2,800	2,800	---	2,800
GENERAL REDUCTION	---	---	---	-540
AIR FORCE RESERVE				
MINOR CONSTRUCTION	3,013	3,013	---	3,013
PLANNING AND DESIGN	3,388	3,388	---	3,388
GENERAL REDUCTION	---	---	---	-1,000
TOTAL, WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	678,301	231,457	-262,804	448,962
FAMILY HOUSING, ARMY				
ALASKA				
BETHEL	386	324	---	386
FORT GREELY	5,203	4,633	---	5,203
KOTZEBUE	386	324	---	386
NOME	386	324	---	386
GEORGIA				
FORT STEWART	14,626	12,637	---	14,626
HAWAII				
ALIAMANU MIL RES	9,900	9,100	---	7,300
LOUISIANA				
FORT POLK	15,342	13,436	---	15,342

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project (1)	DOD request (2)	House allowance (3)	SASC authorization compared to budget (4)	Committee recommendation (5)
GERMANY				
BAYREUTH	1,132	908	---	1,132
WILDFLECKEN	12,157	9,988	---	12,157
WUERZBURG/KITZINGEN	11,140	8,943	---	11,140
ITALY				
LIVORNO - CP DARBY	354	2[illegible]	---	354
VARIOUS LOCATIONS, NATO				
FAMILY HOUSING, 500 UNITS	---	---	(+40,000)	(40,000)
CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS	108,551	105,000	-5,658	102,893
PLANNING	6,750	6,000	---	6,750
SUBTOTAL	186,313	171,909	-5,658	178,055
OPERATING EXPENSES				
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	62,195	60,750	---	62,195
SERVICES ACCOUNT	39,930	39,100	---	39,930
UTILITIES ACCOUNT	306,289	298,289	---	306,289
FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	59,126	75,000	+37,900	97,026
MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT	1,725	1,665	---	1,725
SUBTOTAL	469,265	474,804	+37,900	507,165
LEASING	86,858	84,000	---	86,258
MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	495,365	485,000	-6,438	488,927
INTEREST PAYMENTS,CAPEHART AND WHERRY	2,776	2,776	---	2,776
MORTGAGE INSURANCE PREMIUMS	362	362	---	362
GENERAL REDUCTION	---	---	-15,000	-12,400
NET BUDGET AUTHORITY	1,240,939	1,218,851	+10,804	1,251,143
PLUS APPROPRIATION FOR DEBT REDUCTION	31,700	31,700	---	31,700
TOTAL, FAMILY HOUSING, ARMY	1,272,639	1,250,551	+10,804	1,282,843
FAMILY HOUSING, NAVY				
CALIFORNIA				
MARINE CORPS AIR STATION EL TORO	11,666	10,154	---	11,076
MARINE CORPS BASE CAMP PENDLETON	23,160	20,263	---	21,502
ITALY				
NAVAL AIR STATION SIGONELLA	20,000	20,000	-20,000	---
NAVY SUPPORT OFFICE LA MADDALENA	14,000	---	-14,000	---
PHILIPPINES				
NAVY PUBLIC WORKS CENTER SUBIC BAY	29,300	---	---	27,296
CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS	13,240	7,432	---	13,240
PLANNING	7,395	7,000	---	7,000
GENERAL REDUCTION	---	-10,000	---	---
SUBTOTAL	118,761	54,849	-34,000	80,114

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project (1)	DOD request (2)	House allowance (3)	SASC authorization compared to budget (4)	Committee recommendation (5)
OPERATING EXPENSES				
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTS	38,327	37,327	---	38,327
SERVICES ACCOUNT	29,992	28,192	---	29,992
UTILITIES ACCOUNT	161,498	151,800	---	161,498
FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	16,698	15,698	---	16,698
MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT	93	---	---	93
SUBTOTAL	246,608	233,017	---	246,608
LEASING ACCOUNT	18,212	18,212	---	18,212
MAINTENANCE ACCOUNT	288,652	278,652	---	288,652
INTEREST PAYMENTS FAM HSG DEBT	2,832	2,832	---	2,832
MORTGAGE INS PREMIUMS FAM HSG DEBT	679	679	---	679
GENERAL REDUCTION	---	---	-15,350	-10,703
NET BUDGET AUTHORITY	675,744	588,241	-49,350	626,394
PLUS APPROPRIATION FOR DEBT REDUCTION	28,133	28,133	---	28,133
TOTAL, FAMILY HOUSING, NAVY	703,877	616,374	-49,350	654,527
FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE				
MONTANA				
FORSYTH STRC	4,000	3,512	---	4,000
HAVRE AFS	496	---	---	496
WYOMING				
WARREN AFB	20,000	---	-20,000	---
NETHERLANDS				
CAMP NEW AMSTERDAM	5,218	4,206	---	5,218
PORTUGAL				
LAJES AB	12,262	10,342	---	12,262
UNITED KINGDOM				
RAF GREENHAM COMMON	24,246	---	---	---
RAF UPPER HEYFORD	33,982	28,975	---	33,982
CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS	65,908	59,857	-2,747	63,161
PLANNING	5,000	4,000	---	5,000
SUBTOTAL	171,112	110,892	-22,747	124,119
OPERATING EXPENSES				
MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	24,223	23,735	---	24,223
SERVICES ACCOUNT	24,957	23,910	---	24,957
UTILITIES ACCOUNT	233,306	228,000	---	233,306
FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	42,907	39,455	---	42,907
MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT	177	168	---	177
SUBTOTAL	325,570	315,268	---	325,570
LEASING	59,358	51,562	---	55,808
MAINT OF REAL PROPERTY	335,738	316,485	-2,909	332,839

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project (1)	DOD request (2)	House allowance (3)	SASC authorization compared to budget (4)	Committee recommendation (5)
INTEREST PAYMENTS,CIV HOUSING	3,373	3,373	---	3,373
MORTGAGE INSURANCE,CIV HOUSING	649	649	---	649
GENERAL REDUCTION	---	---	-12,254	---
NET BUDGET AUTHORITY	895,800	798,229	-37,910	842,358
PLUS APPROPRIATION FOR DEBT REDUCTION	51,376	51,376	---	51,376
TOTAL, FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE	947,176	849,605	-37,910	893,734
FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE AGENCIES				
NSA CLASSIFIED PROJECT	1,210	990	---	1,210
CONSTRUCTION IMPROVEMENTS	35	35	---	35
OPERATING EXPENSES				
SERVICES ACCOUNT	11	11	---	11
UTILITIES ACCOUNT	156	156	---	156
FURNISHINGS	1,748	1,178	---	1,748
MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT	545	545	---	545
SUBTOTAL	2,460	1,890	---	2,460
LEASING	15,231	13,006	---	15,231
MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	808	753	---	808
TOTAL, FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE AGENCIES	19,744	16,674	---	19,744
HOMEOWNER'S ASSISTANCE	(4,000)	(4,000)	---	(4,000)
RECAPITULATION				
ARMY	1,375,000	1,215,565	-210,510	1,142,040
NAVY	1,343,700	1,181,905	-117,544	1,232,506
AIR FORCE	2,300,900	1,374,751	-651,694	1,502,491
RESCISSION	---	-91,000	---	---
DEFENSE AGENCIES	398,400	259,042	-76,308	311,750
NATO INFRASTRUCTURE	150,000	100,000	---	50,000
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD	55,300	65,127	+4,972	59,300
AIR NATIONAL GUARD	79,900	110,352	+732	79,900
ARMY RESERVE	52,700	52,700	+3,000	54,700

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT LISTING BY LOCATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project (1)	DOD request (2)	House allowance (3)	SASC authorization compared to budget (4)	Committee recommendation (5)
NAVAL RESERVE	24,800	28,795	†2,900	26,810
AIR FORCE RESERVE	42,200	42,200	---	41,200
TOTAL MILITARY CONSTRUCTION	5,822,900	4,339,437	-1,044,452	4,500,697
FAMILY HOUSING, ARMY	1,272,639	1,250,551	†10,804	1,262,843
PORTION APPLIED TO DEBT REDUCTION	-31,700	-31,700	---	-31,700
FAMILY HOUSING, NAVY	703,877	616,374	-49,350	654,527
PORTION APPLIED TO DEBT REDUCTION	-28,133	-28,133	---	-28,133
FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE	947,176	849,605	-37,910	893,734
PORTION APPLIED TO DEBT REDUCTION	-51,376	-51,376	---	-51,376
FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE AGENCIES	19,744	16,674	---	19,744
GRAND TOTAL	8,655,127	6,961,432	-1,120,908	7,240,336

† INDICATES PREVIOUSLY OR PERMANENTLY AUTHORIZED,

Note.—Projects which show dollar amounts in parenthesis are approved only to be funded through available savings.

○